

THE GREAT POWERS
IN MODERN TIMES
AND
THE GREAT WAR



QUEEN VICTORIA PROCLAIMED EMPRESS OF INDIA

WAL PAGET

QUEEN VICTORIA PROCLAIMED EMPRESS OF INDIA. From a painting by Wal Paget.

The proclamation of Queen Victoria as Empress of India took place to the north of Delhi, the old Mogul capital, on 1st January, 1877, in accordance with an Act passed by the Imperial Parliament the previous year. The illustration shows the central moment of the gorgeous ceremony. The Viceroy, Lord Lytton, is standing, with his brilliant suite, on the canopied and decorated dais, and in front of him Major Barnes, the Chief Herald, is reading the proclamation. The heraldic trumpeters are standing at the foot of the steps. When the proclamation had been read, the Imperial Standard was hoisted above the canopy, the artillery fired a salute of one hundred and one guns, and the infantry a *feu de joie*. Lord Lytton then delivered an address on the motives and significance of the event.

EUROPEAN HISTORY:

Great Leaders & Landmarks
from Early to Modern Times

Volume V

THE GREAT POWERS IN MODERN TIMES

By

William Collinge, M.A.

and

THE GREAT WAR

By

Walter Murray

THE GRESHAM PUBLISHING COMPANY
34 SOUTHAMPTON STREET STRAND LONDON

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION - - - - -	I

PART I

THE WELDING OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

CHAP.		
I.	THE BLACK SEA CONFERENCE - - - - -	13
II.	SOME SETTLEMENTS WITH AMERICA - - - - -	15
III.	THE IMPERIALISM OF DISRAELI - - - - -	22
IV.	THE EASTERN QUESTION AND THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN -	25
V.	AFGHANISTAN AND THE FORWARD POLICY - - - - -	31
VI.	SOUTH AFRICA - - - - -	40
VII.	GREAT BRITAIN AND MODERN EGYPT - - - - -	50
VIII.	THE PARTITION OF AFRICA - - - - -	58
IX.	COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1870 - - - - -	65

PART II

PAN-GERMANISM

X.	THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE - - - - -	71
XI.	GERMAN WORLD POLICY - - - - -	77
XII.	AUSTRIA-HUNGARY - - - - -	85

PART III

PAN-SLAVISM

XIII.	RUSSIA - - - - -	93
XIV.	THE BALKAN STATES - - - - -	114

PART IV

THE LATIN NATIONS

CHAP.		Page
XV.	THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC - - - - -	131
XVI.	ITALY - - - - -	152
XVII.	SPAIN AND PORTUGAL - - - - -	162

PART V

THE POWERS OUTSIDE EUROPE

XVIII.	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - - - - -	170
XIX.	MODERN JAPAN - - - - -	183

CONCLUSION

	THE HISTORICAL CAUSES OF THE EUROPEAN WAR - -	195
--	---	-----

THE GREAT WAR

I.	THE MILITARY POSITION AT THE OUTBREAK OF WAR -	209
II.	THE NAVAL POSITION AT THE OUTBREAK OF WAR -	224
III.	THE GERMAN INVASION OF LUXEMBURG AND BELGIUM -	235
IV.	THE OPENING OF THE NAVAL WAR - - - - -	243
V.	THE GERMAN INVASION OF FRANCE - - - - -	248

ILLUSTRATIONS

PLATES IN COLOUR

	Page
QUEEN VICTORIA PROCLAIMED EMPRESS OF INDIA - <i>Frontispiece</i> From the original painting by Wal Paget	
MAIWAND: SAVING THE GUNS - - - - - From the painting by R. Caton Woodville in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool	36
THE FLIGHT OF THE KHALIFA - - - - - From the painting by R. Talbot Kelly in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool	58
GENERAL SKOBELEFF AT THE SHIPKA PASS - - - - - From the painting by Vassili Verestschagin	96

BLACK-AND-WHITE PLATES

	Page
LORD GRANVILLE—PRINCE GORTSCHAKOFF—HON. CHARLES ADAMS —SIR ALEXANDER COCKBURN - - - - -	14
BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD - - - - -	22
WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE (1874) - - - - -	26
THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN, 1878 (from the painting by Anton von Werner) - - - - -	30
SIR BARTLE FRERE—PRESIDENT KRUGER—CECIL JOHN RHODES— JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN - - - - -	42
SIR GARNET (LORD) WOLSELEY—GENERAL GORDON—SIR EVELYN BARING (LORD CROMER)—SIR H. H. (LORD) KITCHENER - -	54
THE GREAT COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907 - - - - -	66
LEADERS OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS: KARL MARX—FRIED- RICH ENGELS—FERDINAND LASSALLE—AUGUST BEBEL - -	74
GERMAN CHANCELLORS SINCE BISMARCK: GENERAL VON CAPRIVI— PRINCE HOHENLOHE—PRINCE VON BÜLOW—DR. VON BETHMANN- HOLLWEG - - - - -	80
FRANCIS JOSEPH, EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA, KING OF HUNGARY (from the painting by L. Horowitz) - - - - -	88
ALEXANDER II, TSAR OF RUSSIA—ALEXANDER III, TSAR OF RUSSIA —CONSTANTINE PETROVITCH POBYEDONOSTEFF—COUNT WITTE	94
NICHOLAS II, TSAR OF RUSSIA—THE TSARITSA, ALEXANDRA - -	100
LEADERS IN THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR: ADMIRAL ALEXEYEFF— GENERAL KUROPATKIN—MARSHAL OYAMA—ADMIRAL TOGO -	104
ABDUL HAMID, SULTAN OF TURKEY - - - - -	120
RULERS OF THE BALKAN STATES (1912): PETER I, KING OF SERBIA— FERDINAND I, TSAR OF THE BULGARIANS—CAROL I, KING OF RUMANIA—GEORGE I, KING OF THE HELLENES - - - -	126
PRESIDENTS OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC (1871-1894): LOUIS ADOLPHE THIERS—MARSHAL MACMAHON—JULES GRÉVY—SADI CARNOT	132

Illustrations

	Page
PRESIDENTS OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC (1894-1913): JEAN PAUL PIERRE CASIMIR-PÉRIER—FÉLIX FAURE—ÉMILE LOUBET— ARMAND FALLIÈRES - - - - -	140
THE THIRD TRIAL OF CAPTAIN DREYFUS - - - - -	144
KING HUMBERT OF ITALY—SIGNOR CRISPI—VICTOR EMMANUEL III, KING OF ITALY—QUEEN ELENA OF ITALY - - - - -	154
ALFONSO XII, KING OF SPAIN—QUEEN MARIA CHRISTINA OF SPAIN— ALFONSO XIII, KING OF SPAIN—QUEEN VICTORIA EUGENIA OF SPAIN - - - - -	164
PROMINENT PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES: GENERAL ULYSSES S. GRANT—GROVER CLEVELAND—WILLIAM M'KINLEY—THEO- DORE ROOSEVELT - - - - -	176
MUTSU HITO, EMPEROR OF JAPAN—PRINCE ITO—K. INOUÉ—COUNT KOMURA - - - - -	188
HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE—FRIEDRICH WILHELM NIETZSCHE - - - - -	200
WILLIAM II, GERMAN EMPEROR - - - - -	204
A GERMAN 8.2-INCH (21-CM.) SIEGE MORTAR - - - - -	222
H.M.S. "IRON DUKE"—GERMAN BATTLESHIP "FRIEDRICH DER GROSSE" - - - - -	228
PLANS SHOWING FORTIFICATIONS OF LIÈGE AND NAMUR - - - - -	238
GENERAL SIR DOUGLAS HAIG—GENERAL SIR HORACE SMITH-DORRIEN —GENERAL LEMAN—GENERAL VON EMMICH - - - - -	240
ADMIRAL LORD FISHER—ADMIRAL SIR JOHN R. JELlicoe—ADMIRAL SIR DAVID BEATTY—ADMIRAL ALFRED VON TIRPITZ - - - - -	242
H.M.S. "LION"—GERMAN LIGHT CRUISER "MAINZ" - - - - -	246
COMMANDERS-IN-CHIEF OF THE ALLIED FORCES: GENERAL JOFFE— FIELD-MARSHAL SIR JOHN D. P. FRENCH—GRAND-DUKE NICHOLAS—ALBERT, KING OF THE BELGIANS - - - - -	248
MAP SHOWING LINE OF BRITISH RETREAT FROM MONS TO THE MARNE (August 23-September 6, 1914) - - - - -	258

MAP IN COLOUR

NORTHERN FRANCE ILLUSTRATING THE WESTERN CAMPAIGN - - - - -	252
--	-----

THE GREAT POWERS IN MODERN TIMES

INTRODUCTION

It may sound paradoxical, but to understand the year 1914 we must turn back the pages of history for a century until we reach the year 1814. The fact that Europe is now plunged in a devastating war is the logical result of the faults and omissions of the Congress of Vienna of 1814-15. That Congress met to discuss the settlement of a permanent peace, but in reality became a triumph for reaction, dynastic ambition, and the forces of absolutism; for the overt tyranny of Napoleon was substituted the secret sway of Prince Metternich. The lessons of the French Revolution were unlearned, and the main principles of national liberty which had been the professed theory of the Napoleonic policy, however arbitrarily it may have been applied in practice, were completely ignored by the allies. The Revolution was anathema to Metternich, and Napoleon he regarded as its archetype; consequently he stood as the unswerving champion of the restoration of things as they were before the war, or even before 1798, and the results were some gratified royal houses and many dissatisfied nationalities balked in their natural aspirations. "Europe was treated as if it were a blank map which might be divided simply into arbitrary districts of so many square miles and so many inhabitants."¹

The Congress had scarcely met before it became obvious that the allies were more out for loot than liberty, the two most recalcitrant members being Russia and Prussia; consequently the relations between these two Powers and Great Britain, France, and Austria became so strained that hostilities looked possible, when the sudden escape of Napoleon from Elba made a sinking of all differences necessary. The ultimate settlement after Waterloo developed into a reward for monarchical services. Russia ceded East Galicia to Austria, but received Finland, Bessarabia, a portion of Moldavia, and a nominal Polish kingdom was formed under Russian suzerainty, while Cracow was

¹ Richard Lodge's *History of Modern Europe*, p. 629.

declared an independent republic. Austria ceded Belgium, which together with Holland and Luxemburg was welded, willy-nilly, into an independent kingdom of the Netherlands, and in compensation received Lombardy, Venetia, Dalmatia, and Parma, as well as the Tyrol and Salzburg at the expense of Bavaria. Italy was carved up: Sardinia obtained the important port of Genoa, the domains of the Grand Duke of Tuscany were confirmed, and the kingdom of the Two Sicilies was restored to the Bourbons. Prussia gained a great territorial increase—a portion of Poland with Danzig and Posen, half of Saxony, and the Westphalian provinces on the Rhine; while to Bavaria was awarded the Palatinate of the Rhine; and Hanover, with the addition of East Frisia, was elevated to a kingdom. Spain and Portugal were restored to the care of their old dynasties. The French boundaries, in spite of strong Prussian opposition—for even after Waterloo Prussia wished to crush France for ever—were larger than before the Revolution. The services of Great Britain throughout the campaign had been inestimable, and they seemed inadequately rewarded by the confirmation of her colonial possessions and some outposts in Europe; but British statesmen had gained what they wanted—expansion abroad and freedom of action in purely Continental affairs—and a sigh of relief must have escaped them when by the death of William IV the Hanoverian succession was lost to the British Crown.

The next step in the policy of reaction was the formation of the Holy Alliance at the suggestion of the Russian emperor, Alexander I. The idea was welcome to the absolutist Metternich; the Alliance was accordingly subscribed to by Russia, Austria, and Prussia, and was eventually joined by most of the European Powers except Great Britain. The three monarchs solemnly pledged themselves to rule according to the precepts of Christianity, "promote brotherly love among their subjects and do all in their power to maintain peace". Metternich in his heart knew the Alliance to be a "hollow fraud", but acceded to it in order to gain over the Russian emperor to his own views, and by the year 1818 the Alliance had developed into a league for the suppression of liberalism. It will thus be seen that, in spite of all the fair protestations of the rulers of Europe, the elements of discord had only been suppressed for the moment; nor was that moment long delayed. The German peoples were particularly indignant at an arrangement which had been concluded over their heads, more especially at a policy which had sought aggrandisement in Europe and shut them out from colonial expansion. The Prussian democracy was disappointed in the hopes of freedom entertained by the war of liberation, for Frederick William III and his Minister, Hardenberg, became reactionary; the promised constitution was withheld, and, although the lesser German States granted constitutions on the French model, progressive opinion was sternly repressed. The meeting of the Wartburg students in 1817, and the assassination of Kotzebue in the same year, occasioned Metternich alarm, so the Conference of Carlsbad was summoned, by which it was determined to hold a Commission at Mainz to enquire

into these events. Metternich's real object was to suppress the constitutions of the smaller States; but in this he was foiled, as the rulers of these States desired to keep on good terms with their subjects in order to offer resistance to the designs of Austria and Prussia. In France, although Louis XVIII endeavoured to pursue a conciliatory policy, in which he was handicapped by the reactionary desires of the royal family, a royalist reaction set in. Nevertheless the Liberal majority in the Chamber of Deputies increased, and no amount of concessions which were hurriedly resorted to by the king seemed to purchase confidence in the Crown. Tired of the struggle, Louis XVIII practically resigned his authority to the Count of Artois, and the party of reaction triumphed.

The restoration of Ferdinand VII to the Spanish throne was marked by the greatest abuses of absolutism in the face of fair promises made to the Cortes, and political opponents were marked out for ruthless persecution. The Government was carried on by courtiers and Clerical reactionaries. The greatest discontent prevailed, and secret societies abounded. In 1820 a revolt broke out at Cadiz, and the movement spread rapidly, thanks to the incompetence of the Royalists. Ferdinand was forced to give in, accept the constitution of 1812, and dismiss his unpopular Ministers. The same state of affairs prevailed in Portugal, where the absolute and absentee rule of John VI, who preferred to administer the realm from Rio de Janeiro, highly incensed a populace that was already indignant at the entrusting of affairs to a foreigner in the person of Lord Beresford. The result was a revolution in 1820, which broke out simultaneously in Portugal and Brazil, so John VI was forced to retire from Brazil, leaving the administration to his son, Dom Pedro, and return to Portugal, only to accept the constitution. Brazil then proclaimed her independence, and Dom Pedro, who had refused to obey the summons to return to Portugal, became the first Emperor of Brazil.

In Italy the same conditions of dull reaction prevailed; in Lombardy and Venetia the situation being rendered doubly worse by the Austrian and foreign occupation. Parma and Modena were under the tutelage of Vienna, and Leo XII was concerned with the temporalities of the Holy See. A small ray of freedom shone in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany owing to the extension of a certain freedom of speech which was denied to institutions. Ferdinand I at Naples was a Hapsburg puppet, while Victor Emmanuel I fulminated at Turin against French propaganda, and even considered the advisability of disinheriting his nephew and heir-apparent, Charles Albert, convicted of liberal sympathies. The activities of the secret societies, which flourished exceedingly on Italian soil, increased, and a revolution in Naples succeeded in forcing a constitution from Ferdinand I. The movement spread to Sicily, but the rising was quelled by General Florestan P  p  .

Thus Europe was in a state of ferment within five years of the Congress of Vienna and the Treaty of the Holy Alliance. Metternich, thoroughly alarmed, summoned a Congress at Troppau, in Silesia,

to enquire into the prevalent unrest, and especially into Italian affairs and those of Naples in particular. In spite of British protests, armed interference was decided upon, the Congress was removed to Laibach, and Ferdinand was asked to attend in person. Professing devotion to the constitution, Ferdinand was permitted to repair to Laibach, when he promptly forgot his obligations and agreed to the dispatching of Austrian troops to his realm. The Neapolitans were hopelessly out-matched by the Austrians, and Ferdinand returned to Naples to abjure the constitution and wreak his vengeance on his political opponents. No sooner was the Neapolitan revolution quelled than the Austrian troops had to put down a rising in Piedmont, and Victor Emmanuel I abdicated in favour of Charles Felix, Charles Albert, the heir-apparent, being forced into exile for his liberal sympathies. Meanwhile rebellion had broken out again in Spain and in Greece, and a further Congress met at Verona. A peremptory demand for an alteration of the constitution was addressed to the Spanish Government, and as this was equally peremptorily refused, a punitive expedition was entrusted to the French. The revolutionaries were suppressed with great severity, and, in spite of British protests, a French army remained in occupation. Portugal once more followed the Spanish example, and the reactionary party gained the upper hand. John VI was in favour of granting some measure of liberty to his subjects, but fell a victim to his wife's and son's—Dom Miguel's—intrigues, and fled the country.

The triumph of the Holy Alliance seemed complete, when in 1825 the death of Alexander I of Russia altered the complexion of things, and incidentally put an end to the league. Alexander was succeeded by his son Nicholas, whose elder brother, the Grand Duke Constantine, had resigned his rights to the throne, and the new emperor at once began to reverse his father's policy and return to a purely Russian and national standpoint. From that moment the power of Metternich began to wane. An understanding was at once arrived at between Great Britain and Russia with regard to some of the near Eastern questions and Greece, who for several years had been struggling with varying fortune to recover her independence, and a secret convention was signed between the two Powers to establish a separate kingdom of Greece, but tributary to the Porte. Domestic difficulties caused the sultan, Mahmoud II, to be pliable in many respects to Russian demands, especially in the matter of Serbia, but he haughtily refused to listen to the proposal for Greek liberation which was put before him in accordance with the Treaty of London, 6 July, 1827, which had been signed by Russia, Great Britain, and France. The allied fleets accordingly sailed against the Egyptian flotilla, which had come to the rescue of the Porte, and obtained a crushing victory over it at Navarino (20 October, 1827). Mahmoud II still refused to yield, and Russia, who was now without the assistance of Great Britain, declared war on Turkey single-handed. The Russian campaign was a distinct failure, and Metternich intrigued to save Turkey, but failed to obtain the support of France and Prussia. A change of command turned the tide

in favour of the Russians, who appeared before Adrianople. Such a near approach to his capital alarmed Mahmoud II, and a treaty was concluded at Adrianople whereby the Greek claims were granted. A further conference was held at London in February, 1830, when the affairs of the new kingdom were settled, though unfortunately—which was to be a source of future trouble—the frontiers were not based on the principle of nationality. Some difficulty was experienced in providing a king, but eventually the throne was accepted by Otho I, a younger son of the King of Bavaria.

The year 1830 begins that definite undoing of the Metternich system which culminated in the widespread revolution in Europe of 1848. The death of Louis XVIII, that amiable but incompetent monarch, brought to the French throne the absolutist Comte d'Artois as Charles X. The new reign was at once initiated with reactionary changes, and the king handed himself over to the ultramontanes. But the popular clamour forced him to dismiss his chief instrument, Villèle, and make a pretence of forming a more moderate Ministry under Martignac. Soon a pretext was found to get rid of him, and Charles entrusted his affairs to Prince Jules de Polignac. Inasmuch as Polignac was an *émigré* and stood for the things before the revolution, the appointment was deeply resented. Charles stiffened his resolution, after an unsuccessful attempt to distract attention at home by military prowess abroad, and issued the famous "ordinances for the execution of the laws and the safety of the State", which fell upon an amazed nation like a thunderbolt. Lafayette at once put himself at the head of an insurrection, and, in spite of his tardy amends in dismissing Polignac, Charles was deposed and a provisional government was formed. The conspirators, who still held the name of Metternich in respect, feared to form a republic, so the throne was offered to the Duke of Orleans, who, with considerable treachery to Charles, accepted, and became known as Louis Philippe, "King of the French".

The next blow offered to the Metternich settlement came from Belgium, which by the Treaty of Vienna had been incorporated with Holland under William I as the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The arrangement had taken no account of the age-long racial and religious differences of the two nations, and was foredoomed to failure; moreover the marked preference of William I for his Dutch subjects had not tended to mend matters. Fired by the success of the French revolution in 1830, a general rebellion broke out throughout Belgium, marked by excesses at Brussels, Verviers, and other large towns. William sent his eldest son, the Prince of Orange, on a conciliatory mission. The prince recommended a separate legislature and administration for Belgium. The king appeared to acquiesce in the suggestion, but on the summoning of the States General refused to discuss the matter. Accordingly the rebellion spread, and the support of the army having been obtained, the Dutch troops were expelled from most of the strongholds. A provisional government was proclaimed, and the independence of Belgium established. It now became the question of the

form of government, and Belgian affairs looked like embroiling the chief Powers in another war. Finally a conference of ministers held at London succeeded in imposing an armistice upon the Dutch and Belgians, while a national congress at Brussels decreed a separate state for Belgium under a monarchy. These proceedings were subsequently ratified by the Powers, and the Belgian throne was eventually accepted by Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who was married to the British Princess Charlotte. The terms of settlement with regard to boundaries, &c., which for want of space cannot be dealt with fully here, were extremely distasteful to William I of Holland, who, relying on Russian support, suddenly invaded Belgium, which, in turn, relying on the support of the Western Powers, was totally unprepared for war. Leopold met with a crushing defeat at Tirlemont, and the French army and the British navy came to the rescue. A further conference held at London issued twenty-four articles modifying somewhat the Belgian frontiers, particularly in the cession of Limburg to Holland.

Still William refused to give way, so a blockade of the Dutch coast became necessary. Antwerp fell on 23 December, 1832, and a preliminary treaty of peace was signed, which was, however, not fully ratified by the Dutch king till January, 1839.

Another flagrant example of the artificial character of the Treaty of Vienna was afforded by the kingdom of Poland. As constituted it was only a portion of the ancient Polish dominion, and its independence under a Russian viceroy was purely fictitious. The Grand Duke Constantine, who, it will be remembered, had refused the Russian throne, soon began to rule despotically at Warsaw, and was forced to flee from an insurrection which broke out in that city on 29 November, 1830. Poland looked as if she had regained her freedom, but the fatal division of counsel which had always marred Polish affairs again prevailed on this occasion. Parties were divided between the followers of Chlopicki, who was anxious to come to an understanding with Russia, and Adam Czartoriski, who wished to press on the revolution at full speed. The result was that no progress was made, and it became necessary to make overtures to the Emperor Nicholas; but Nicholas would only hear of unconditional submission. Moreover, foreign interference was out of the question, as most of the Powers took the opportunity of Russia's necessities to settle favourably their outstanding differences with her.

A Russian army was dispatched against Warsaw; after a heroic defence that city capitulated, chiefly owing to her internal quarrels, and Poland, now deprived of her constitution, became a Russian province.

Thus Europe lumbered on, seething with discontent in every country—not even excepting Great Britain—which was on the eve of the Reform Bill. The German provinces were clamouring for liberal institutions, and the absolutist rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria met in solemn conclave at Münchengrätz to debate how to defend their rights against democratic chambers, with the result that German aspirations were repressed; Switzerland was forced to reform her constitution on more

democratic lines; Italy was in a state of transition from the Alps to Sicily—risings had broken out in Modena, Parma, and the Papal States, and Austrian bayonets had restored a semblance of order; France under Louis Philippe was discontented with partial representation which handed most of the power over to the middle classes, consequently there was a perpetual conflict between capital and labour; and Spain, after the death of Ferdinand VII, was plunged into a squabble as to the succession—when the year 1848 dawned and brought with it the deluge, jestingly prophesied by Metternich.

As usual, the trouble began in France, where Louis Philippe had long outstayed his welcome and where universal discontent prevailed, since the lower classes were practically without representation. The Liberals under Thiers were weak and to some extent subservient to the king. The chances of reform, then, lay with the Radicals, under the leadership of Odilon Barrot, who started a violent campaign for electoral reform. Louis Philippe at first assumed a haughty attitude, then fatally climbed down to an extremely conciliatory position and entrusted the formation of a pacific ministry to M. Molé. On the failure of Molé the king turned to M. Thiers, who refused office unless he could be associated with Odilon Barrot. However, Thiers' attempt to press electoral reform was too late; the king, howled down by the mob, deemed it prudent to abdicate in favour of his grandson, and appointed the Duchess of Orleans as regent. But the mob refused to recognize a regency, and Louis Philippe fled to England. A provisional government was formed and the Republic was declared. However, its existence was threatened almost immediately by the impracticability of some of its socialistic measures, especially in the foundation of public workshops, which proved a failure financially in addition to becoming a menace to private enterprise. The Government decided to suppress them, and rioting of the fiercest description broke out in the streets of Paris.

The conflagration which had started in France soon spread to the rest of Europe, and the Metternich edifice tottered into ruins. In Germany the storm broke out with extraordinary fury, so, to save their thrones, the rulers of all the petty States granted new constitutions. Mere constitutions were not enough for the German people, who demanded a complete unity and the reformation of the *Bund*, so Prussia and Austria summoned a conference of princes for 15 March to consider the question of this *Bund*. But the rulers of these countries had awakened to their danger too late. In Austria riots occurred at Vienna and Prague, while Hungary vociferously demanded her autonomy. The game was up, and Prince Metternich fled to England without striking a blow for his principles. Frederick William IV still held out in Prussia, but serious riots broke out in Berlin, and the king, now thoroughly alarmed, put himself at the head of the Liberal movement. Constitutions followed for Saxony, Bavaria, and Hanover, and the triumph of the Liberals seemed complete. Want of space prevents us from describing at length the movements of the German federal party. A *Vorparlament* was held at

Frankfort on 31 March to settle a great national constitution, when the democratic party, after some incitement to rioting, failed to carry their extravagant plan of founding a German republic.

The news of the revolution in France and Germany was hailed with enthusiasm in Italy, where the liberal and patriotic utterances of the new Pope, Pius IX, had led to extravagant hopes of deliverance from the Hapsburg and Bourbon yoke. The revolution broke out at Milan and soon spread to Venice, Monza, Como, Bergamo, Brescia, and Cremona, while the Austrian General, Radetsky, retired towards the Quadrilateral. Charles Albert of Sardinia determined to strike a blow for Italian liberty, and declared war against Austria. Radetsky waited for reinforcements at Verona, and the Sardinian army overran Lombardy. The success, however, of Charles Albert was but shortlived. Radetsky having now been reinforced inflicted a crushing defeat upon him at Custoza; the Sardinian king was glad to sign an armistice, and in a short time Northern Italy was once more under the Austrian sway. But the Revolution met with considerable success in Central Italy. Pius IX fled to Gaeta, where he was eventually joined by another refugee, Leopold II of Tuscany, and republics were accordingly proclaimed at Rome and Florence.

Meanwhile Austria was facing a crisis in Hungary and Bohemia: in Hungary Kossuth demanded a constitution, and the Bohemians asked for an independent government. The Bohemian revolt was eventually put down by the taking of Prague, but the Hungarian trouble proved much more difficult to quell. Conciliatory measures failed, largely due to the antagonism between the Magyars and Slavs, and there was nothing for it but a state of declared war. Meanwhile the mob grew out of hand at Vienna, and the Emperor Ferdinand fled to Olmütz. The Hungarians marched to the rescue of the Viennese insurgents, but were defeated at Schwechat, and the reactionary party triumphed. The Emperor Ferdinand then abdicated in favour of his nephew, Francis Joseph. The new emperor threw himself with vigour into the task of subduing Hungary, but with complete failure at the outset, as the Austrians were everywhere repulsed, and the Hungarians triumphantly declared their independence. Francis Joseph appealed to Russia for help, and the Emperor Nicholas dispatched 130,000 men under Paskiewitsch into Hungary. This proved the turning-point, as the numbers were too unequal for the Hungarians, who were severely defeated at Temesvar and Vilagos.

Meanwhile in Piedmont Charles Albert had been unable to conclude an honourable peace with Austria and, encouraged by the hope of a prolongation of the Hungarian difficulties, had resumed hostilities. Radetsky, however, instead of remaining on the defensive, as the king had hoped, assumed a vigorous offensive, invaded Piedmont, and completely routed the Sardinian army at Novara. Charles Albert refused the exorbitant terms of peace imposed by the Austrians, and abdicated the throne in favour of his eldest son, Victor Emmanuel II. The new king accepted somewhat milder terms of peace—since he was

not a liberal suspect—and entered on his reign under a cloud of unpopularity, which was in strange contrast to the subsequent glory of his career. The Austrians proceeded to make good their victory throughout the peninsula. Tuscany was restored to the Grand Duke, the Republic was overthrown at Rome, Venice was forced to capitulate, and Ferdinand succeeded in reducing Sicily to obedience.

To return to Germany. The success of the party of reaction in Vienna had hardened the heart of King Frederick William IV of Prussia; so seizing the opportunity of a riot in Berlin occasioned by the sitting of the first constitutional chamber, he annulled the original constitution and substituted one of his own contriving, consisting of two chambers, chosen by indirect election. Meanwhile the adjourned *Vorparlament* had met as a grand national assembly at Frankfort, on 18 May, 1848, to devise a constitution to unify the German nation, when what is known as "the fundamental laws" were proclaimed. The position of Austria in the forming of an empire was a chief subject of discussion, but unfortunately instead of coming to some definite agreement for solving their difficulty, the members wasted time in matters of mere academic interest, and Austria, through Prince Schwarzenberg, asserted her claim to maintain her influence as the legatee of the old Holy Roman Empire. The result was that beginning of the definite struggle between Austria and Prussia for the German hegemony which was to end in Sadowa. Eventually the constitution was defined on a democratic basis, and by a narrow majority it was decided to offer the imperial crown to King Frederick William IV of Prussia. But the democratic conditions of the offer were distasteful to a Hohenzollern, and it was accordingly refused. This refusal proved the death-blow of the Frankfort assembly. An attempt was made to induce the other German countries to accept the constitution, and the assembly was moved to Stuttgart, where it was eventually broken up by the Würtemberg government. The result was that Germany became divided between the adherents of Austria and those of Prussia.

The second French Republic had but a short existence. The rise to the presidency of Prince Louis Napoleon made a return to monarchical institutions but a question of time. When the period of his presidency was about to expire, Louis Napoleon by an adroit handling of the popular vote succeeded in extending his term of office to ten years. This was but the thin end of the wedge for the consolidation of his power. On 2 December, 1852, after a constitutional show of a plebiscite, the Prince was declared Emperor of the French as Napoleon III. The humiliation of the Metternich policy was now complete. France was once more to become a disturbing element in Continental politics. Nor was the fitful peace which had been preserved between the Great Powers since 1815 to be long preserved.

From a tiny beginning the Eastern Question once more became acute, but the real causes were to be found in the mutual antipathies of Nicholas of Russia and Napoleon III. The dispute arose between the Greek and Latin Churches concerning the custody of the Holy

Places, but the championing of the Latin Church somewhat conspicuously by Napoleon magnified the diplomatic importance of the question. Nicholas professed to take umbrage, though in secret he desired an excuse for aggression against the weakened Ottoman Empire. An attempt was made to buy off Great Britain which signally failed, and an arrogant demand was directed to the Porte requiring the recognition of the Russian protectorate over all Turkish subjects belonging to the Greek Church. This was refused, and the Russian army proceeded to occupy Moldavia and Wallachia. The Porte then declared war, and Napoleon III seized the opportunity of coming to an understanding with Great Britain—which was pledged to the policy of maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire—and the two Powers, after concluding a treaty with the Porte, in 1854 declared war on Russia. Want of space forbids us to dwell upon the campaign, which was very soon transferred from Turkish territory to the Crimea. After the evacuation of Sebastopol (10 September, 1855), Russia, at the intervention of Austria, accepted an armistice, and a treaty was eventually signed at Paris, concerning the terms of which we shall find occasion to speak later.

At the conclusion of the Crimean War Napoleon became the most prominent personage in Europe, and French diplomacy ruled the roast. Ever mindful of the necessity of upholding his dynasty by deeds of military glory, the Emperor turned his attention to Italian affairs. An opportunity of bringing those affairs to a head had been found by the adroitness of Cavour—the great Piedmontese statesman—who by the dispatching of a Sardinian contingent to assist the allies in the Crimea, was able to secure the representation of his country at the Congress of Paris and was thus in a position to declaim against Austrian misrule in Italy. Napoleon came to an understanding with Cavour at Plombières, and at the price of the cession of Savoy and Nice to France the support of French bayonets was promised. The reader need not be detained over the details of this wonderful war of liberation by which the Austrians were overthrown and that most significant fact of modern times—the united kingdom of Italy—was accomplished, as a full description will be found in the article on Garibaldi in Vol. IV. Napoleon, in spite of the victory of Solferino, fearful of Prussian intervention, hurriedly signed the Treaty of Villafranca, and Italy had to wait some years for her full reward.

In Germany the rivalry between Austria and Prussia increased, owing to the death of Frederick VII of Denmark and the consequent opening up of the Schleswig-Holstein question. Prussia was now under the sway of Bismarck, who had the full confidence of his master, King William, in his determination to win for her the hegemony in Germany. Leaving alone the disputes and military operations in the Duchies themselves, on 14 August, 1865, a convention was made at Gastein between Austria and Prussia whereby it was agreed that Austria should administer Holstein and Prussia Schleswig, and both sides prepared themselves for the inevitable fray. Bismarck concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with Italy, and wrote to Vienna to complain of the Austrian administration of Holstein. When the actual war broke out it was expected that it

would be a lengthy affair, but the Prussian organization proved to be so superior that it was all over within seven weeks, and Austria was overwhelmingly defeated at Sadowa, or Königgratz. Such a sudden and unexpected rise to the height of power on the part of Prussia was extremely unwelcome to Napoleon, who was beginning to feel himself eclipsed abroad, in addition to the fact that at home his spiritless policy with regard to the Polish insurrection of 1863 and his vacillating interference during the recent war, as well as the failure of his Mexican scheme, had rendered him unpopular. Moreover, the Italian patronage had gone all wrong, and leaning on Prussia, the young kingdom of Italy had been able to obtain Venetia in spite of a severe naval reverse at Lissa. To save his dynasty military glory was necessary to Napoleon; moreover he was alarmed at such a powerful neighbour in the east, and sought to obtain the Rhine as a frontier for France, by claiming "compensation" at the expense of the South German States, to the secret joy of Bismarck, who, by divulging the Napoleonic demands, readily obtained South German support.

The events that led to the war between France and Germany are told in the chapter on Bismarck in Vol. IV; suffice it to say here that public opinion in France was very excited, and when the vacant throne of Spain was offered to a Hohenzollern prince of, it is true, a cadet branch, the clamour against Prussia became excessive. Napoleon was forced to go to war for his own safety and in deference to the wish of the nation. The affair of the "Ems" dispatch provided an immediate excuse, and war was declared on 19 July, 1870. Within six months Napoleon had fled from his country and Paris had capitulated.

When, amidst the splendid surroundings of Versailles and all the pomp and circumstance of glittering uniform and flashing sword, the triumphant cheers of the German princes acclaimed William of Hohenzollern their emperor, a new era dawned for Europe. Henceforth the centre of European diplomacy was to be shifted from Paris to Berlin, and France for many years must be isolated. For close upon a quarter of a century Prince Bismarck becomes the supreme minister of Prussia and the iron-willed moulder of German destiny.

The somewhat spiritless foreign policy pursued by Lord Granville during the Franco-Prussian war and after—a policy which had displayed the cold and correct attitude of the strictest neutrality—and the superior diplomatic ability of Bismarck had lowered the prestige of Great Britain on the Continent. The amazing revelations of a draft treaty, in the writing of the French Ambassador to Berlin, Benedetti, proposing a violation of the Belgian neutrality, had loosened the last sentimental ties that bound the British to their quondam allies in the Crimea. More or less keeping aloof owing to the preponderance of Berlin, and to a certain extent through self-interest and natural inclination, Great Britain for twenty years maintains a policy of "splendid isolation" from purely Continental affairs. Her few incursions into the vexed questions of the Continent are only necessitated when such questions touch upon her imperial responsibilities outside Europe.

The period from 1870 to 1885 may be described for Britain as a period of imperial construction. Frequently during these years the Empire wages wars, of great and small importance, with distant tribes or races in protection of the outposts of her empire, and all this activity, sometimes forced upon her unwittingly and unwillingly, helps to bring about the splendid imperial understanding of to-day, the tidings of which were to be proclaimed by the First Colonial Conference of 1887 and the foundation in that year of the Imperial Institute, which was to commemorate the death of the old traditional *laissez-aller* attitude of British colonial policy.

We propose in the first section to show by isolated episodes—as it were a series of word-pictures—and ignoring as far as possible the history of domestic policy, how British Imperialism is dragged into the arena of Continental politics, and as the episodes declare themselves the reader will be aware of how the tireless, but sometimes clumsy, diplomacy of the German Foreign Office has been pulling the delicate wires of international relationship. In the subsequent sections the main activities of the great World Powers will be dealt with, and more especially attention will be drawn to the two European movements known as “Pan-Germanism” and “Pan-Slavism”. Then it will be manifest how, for a few years satisfied with her pose of satiated ambition and the very necessary work of the consolidation of the new empire, Germany embarks on that ambition for world-dominion which is to end in the most terrible war in the history of mankind.

The most significant fact of the nineteenth century is the shrinking of the European boundaries. The march of events, the discoveries of science, the ease of locomotion, and the hundred-and-one activities of commerce and civilization have Europeanized the greater portion of the globe. Disputes about boundaries no longer engross the attention of chancelleries of the Continent: their anxiety is for colonial expansion and spheres of influence. But in this struggle for colonial possessions Germany had arrived as a first-class Power too late upon the scene. Most of the favoured spots of the earth had been appropriated by her older-established rivals, and the greatest prizes had fallen to Great Britain. Everywhere in her search for delectable places in the sun Germany feels chilled by the shadow of British power. She was too late for the titbits of Africa, and, casting longing eyes upon the harbours, latent wealth, and tantalizing “spheres of influence” in South America, she is held up by the sentinel challenge of the Monroe Doctrine. The British-Japanese alliance of 1902, pledged to the maintenance of the policy of the open door, bars the way in China and the Far East.

The policy of “splendid isolation” had brought forth good fruit. If between 1870 and 1885 the centre of European diplomacy was to be found at Berlin, henceforth the newer world-diplomacy must take its cue from London. So Great Britain is the enemy; it must be at her expense that Germany shall realize her overweening dream of world-dominion.

PART I

The Welding of the British Empire

CHAPTER I

THE BLACK SEA CONFERENCE

Throughout the war of 1870-1 Bismarck had been obsessed by the fear of neutral intervention, and the whole weight of his tireless diplomacy, working through his numerous agents in every land and the power of his subsidized press, was directed to the prevention of such a result. Italy had found him friendly when the ultramondane world was shocked at the taking of Rome and the shattering of the Temporal Power of the Pope, while before Austria he dangled the dangers ahead from the settlement of the newly formed Dual Monarchy and from Italian irredantism, with an eye to the recovery of the Trentino. But above all Bismarck feared intervention from Great Britain and Russia; he, therefore, cast about for a means of embroiling the two nations in order to divert their attention from the war. Knowing that Great Britain at the time was diplomatically embarrassed by the perpetual *Alabama* claim of the United States, he pointed out to the Russian chancellor, Prince Gortschakoff, that the moment was favourable for him to denounce the Treaty of Paris of 1856.

Prince Gortschakoff hesitated, both from the dictates of scruple and prudence, to take such a momentous step. But Bismarck exerted such pressure on the chancellor through the Russian military plenipotentiary, Count Kutusoff, that finally he consented and urged the Tsar to raise the whole question of the neutrality of the Black Sea. Baron Brunnow, the Russian ambassador in London, was instructed to inform the British Government that the time had come to denounce the convention to his majesty the sultan. The prince, in his instructions, pointed out that the treaty had frequently been violated, and that the emperor could not be expected to acknowledge the principle that a treaty should remain binding in some things which had been broken in others.

By the 11th and 14th articles of the Treaty of Paris it was expressly stipulated that ships of war of every nation, except a few police vessels, should be excluded from the Black Sea, and that this

Welding of the British Empire

provision could not be annulled or modified without the consent of the signatory powers. These clauses had met with bitter opposition from Russia during the *pourparlers*, and the enforcing of them had cost the allies nine further months of weary warfare.

That the publication of Prince Gortschakoff's dispatch should throw the country into the greatest excitement and alarm was to be expected. Entangled as Great Britain was by the vexatious *Alabama* question, and all the pressure that the United States could bring to bear, and with the knowledge that France was *hors de combat* and that the two remaining chief signatories to the treaty, Austria and Italy, were not sufficiently interested to uphold it, it was recognized that Prince Gortschakoff had chosen his moment very well. A warlike feeling prevailed, *The Times* going so far as to allude to "this most insolent state paper", and even the pacific Gladstone professed to be outraged by the form of Prince Gortschakoff's dispatch with its cynical disregard of the obligation of treaties.

Lord Granville sent a very temperately worded dispatch to the British ambassador at St. Petersburg (Petrograd), in which he pointed out that a party can only be relieved of a treaty by the original parties to the document, and the moderate nature of his communication created a favourable impression in Europe. Of course, Lord Granville was not slow to recognize the handiwork of Bismarck, and he dispatched Odo Russell to Versailles on a special mission. Bismarck feigned surprise at the Russian note, but on Odo Russell threatening war unless the Russian circular were withdrawn, the prince to some extent climbed down from his position, as the last thing he really desired, taking into consideration the state of German fortunes, was a conflict between Russia and Great Britain, with the likelihood of such a conflict developing into a European conflagration and the possible snatching away of the German chestnuts unroasted. His purpose had been gained in diverting the attention of Russia from the west, so he now favoured conciliatory measures and counselled the holding of a conference at St. Petersburg to discuss matters in dispute concerning the Treaty of Paris. Enquiry at other courts had divulged a certain sympathy with the Russian position, it being felt that the restrictions as to the Black Sea were humiliating to a first-class power whose peaceable intentions seemed assured.

Lord Granville, therefore, consented to a conference, but, suspicious of Russian and Prussian complicity, refused to hold it at St. Petersburg. In deference to the premier position of Great Britain as a signatory to the treaty it was eventually decided to hold the conference in London, on the distinct understanding that there was no foregone conclusion. In fact, "the Foreign Office was so anxious on this subject that the words 'no previous assumption', 'no assumption', and 'no foregone conclusion' occurred twenty times in some sixteen dispatches".

As a matter of fact, when the conference did meet, in March, 1871, the result was a foregone conclusion—Russia at once denounced the



LORD GRANVILLE

From a photograph by Elliott & Fry, Ltd



PRINCE GORTSCHAKOFF

From a photograph

NAWAE 1220 1014 1014 1014



HON. CHARLES ADAMS

American Arbitrator in Alabama Case



SIR ALEXANDER COCKBURN

Arbitrator for Great Britain in Alabama Case

treaty. The congress did its work with great rapidity. The clauses in the treaty that neutralized the Black Sea and closed its waters to the navies of Russia and Turkey were removed; but the clause that closed the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus against the navies of foreign powers in times of peace was upheld, it being stipulated that these straits could only be opened to friendly Powers whenever the Treaty of Paris was in danger.

The result of the conference was undoubtedly a blow to British diplomacy, as it had undone a provision which Britain had held out for strongly after the Crimean War, and it was felt that Lord Granville had erred in making overtures to Bismarck when Russia was really not in a position—since she had no fleet in Black Sea waters—to uphold her claims. Consequently, before opening negotiations, Russia would have had to withdraw her circular. But it must be remembered that the difficulties of Great Britain's position had been increased by the anxieties of her foreign relations and the absence of her former ally and principal co-signatory to the treaty—France.

Taking into consideration the pressure exerted by Bismarck, who had not hesitated to state in the most brutal way that no Frenchman should be present, it would have been more consonant with the dignity of British diplomacy to have insisted on a postponement of the conference till France was in a position to send her representatives.

But, on the other hand, it must be acknowledged that conditions had changed since the days of Palmerston, and European opinion was against the slight inflicted on Russia by the treaty. The one bright result of the conference was the solemn proclamation issued by it upholding the sanctity of treaties.

CHAPTER II

SOME SETTLEMENTS WITH AMERICA

Immediately the Civil War was over a strong protest was raised by the American Government with regard to the part that Great Britain had played during the war, and claims were made in respect of the damages inflicted by the notorious Confederate cruiser *Alabama*, which, eluding the surveillance of the British Government, had been allowed to leave the shipbuilding yard of Messrs. Laird of Birkenhead in the guise of a peaceable merchant-vessel.

The chief cause of complaints of American ministers against Great Britain was based on what they were pleased to call her "premature" recognition of the Confederate states as belligerents. They considered that this action had elevated what was merely a local insurrection into the status of a civil war. Under such circumstances they contended that Great Britain was morally responsible for the loss of life and treasure that ensued. Her majesty's Government replied that in con-

ceding belligerent rights to the South they were merely recognizing a fact which the Americans themselves were forced to acknowledge six weeks later, and they denied that the proclamation had been responsible for prolonging the war.

But undoubtedly the Americans had a better case in seeking for damages for the losses inflicted by the *Alabama*, and the serious evasions of neutrality afforded to her sister cruisers the *Florida* and the *Georgia*. In fact it was impossible for the British Government to escape from a dilemma. "If she (*Alabama*) should not have been detained, Lord John Russell should not have ordered her detention. The *Alabama* either should or should not have been detained."¹

For several months the controversy was pursued in a desultory way, and no serious attempt was made to come to a settlement. Meanwhile Lord John Russell's ministry fell, and on the succession of Lord Stanley to the Foreign Office the question was reopened. As was natural, Lord Stanley defended the action of his predecessor vigorously, both with regard to the *Alabama* and the other vessels; but, owing to the inconvenience of the situation between two friendly nations, he expressed himself as willing to accept the principle of arbitration, although in adopting such a course he wished it to be clear that his Government could not allow the American claim against Great Britain's premature recognition of the belligerent status of the Confederate states. Little progress was made in the direction of a settlement, because Mr. Seward, the American Foreign Secretary, refused to waive these claims and wished the whole case to go to the arbitrator.

Early in 1868 Mr. Seward made a fresh effort to settle these points of difference, as well as others which had been outstanding for some little time between the two countries, notably the rights of naturalized citizens in the two countries, the definition of the boundary between the United States and Vancouver Island, and the settlement of the thorny "fisheries" question in Newfoundland.

A change of ministers in Washington and London—Mr. Thornton succeeding Lord Lyons in the former city, and Mr. Reverdy Johnson, Adams in the latter—produced a healthier feeling. An agreement with regard to the naturalized citizens was arrived at, but the settlement of the boundary question was not so readily solved.

To recapitulate ancient history, in 1846 an arrangement had been concluded that the 49th parallel should be the boundary between the United States and Canada, and Vancouver Island was given to Great Britain. But it happens that the channel between Vancouver and the mainland, which under the arrangement would form the boundary, is broken by islands, one of these being the Island of San Juan, and, as this island soon became settled and of importance, complications were bound to take place. An awkward affair arose through the action of General Harvey, the commander in Oregon, who professed to believe that a British ship had been sent to seize an American citizen. In spite of a firm denial by the Government of Vancouver, General Harvey

¹ Walpole's *History of Twenty-five Years*, Vol. III.

had continued the correspondence and landed a detachment on the island to await the instructions of the American Government. Finally, a clumsy compromise was effected by the installation of a garrison from both nations, and this arrangement continued until the close of the war.

When in 1868 Mr. Reverdy Johnson and Lord Stanley threw out *pourparlers* for arbitration, it was at once agreed to submit the question of San Juan to the arbitrator. This was so encouraging that both ministers, dodging the "premature recognition" difficulty, agreed to the principle of arbitration between the two Governments with regard to the *Alabama* claims, and a convention was drawn up, which was eventually modified by Mr. Seward, who considered that Mr. Reverdy Johnson had exceeded his instructions. Lord Clarendon succeeded Lord Stanley at the Foreign Office, and he was able to follow up his predecessor's efforts and sign a convention modified from the former, and Washington was appointed as the place of meeting for commissioners.

But, in spite of all the goodwill displayed on the part of Great Britain, it is to be regretted that the Americans were not very eager for settlement, and displayed at the time a strong anti-English feeling. Moreover, a change of Government, resulting in the election of General Grant as President and the sending of Motley, the historian, in place of Reverdy Johnson to London, did not help to smooth matters. The greatest malcontent and fire-brand among American statesmen was Mr. Charles Sumner, who pressed forward the most extravagant demands for indirect claims for the "premature recognition". In fact, Mr. Sumner became obsessed by the idea that if he held out long enough he could obtain territorial concessions from Great Britain, being a victim to a prevalent delusion that the British had very little esteem for their colonies and regarded them as a dead-weight on the national progress. Consequently he talked of the cession of the British North-American Colonies, the West Indies, and a pecuniary indemnity which in effect might amount to four hundred millions sterling. Naturally, with the prevalence of such wild and preposterous ideas, no progress could be made, and the convention, to the regret of the sober-minded of both countries, was rejected by the Senate.

Meanwhile there remained the century-old Newfoundland fisheries dispute to be settled. By a treaty of 1783 American fishermen had the right to fish off the coast of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and until 1812 this right remained undisputed; but after the Second American War both countries were unable to agree whether the circumstances of the war had rendered the contract invalid. This unsatisfactory state of affairs prevailed until 1818, when a new treaty was concluded, by which American fishermen were confined to the southern shores of the Magdalen Islands, to a portion of the west and south-west coast of Newfoundland, and to the Labrador coast from Mount John northward. There were also provisions for curing fish in these parts, and the United States undertook not to take or cure fish in other waters of the British colonies. As the British contended that their territorial

waters, instead of following the head of the coast, must be measured from headland to headland, the American fishermen were forbidden the waters of the great gulfs of Newfoundland. The British claims were large and the American practice was equally comprehensive. "On one side a wide claim, on the other side a loose practice, was increasing the tension between the two countries."¹

This fishing controversy lasted until 1854, when an arrangement was concluded for ten years, terminable by either side on twelve months' notice, by which, with a few exceptions, the coasts of British North America were opened to American fishermen, and the coasts of the United States north of the 36th parallel were free to British fishermen. This agreement terminated in 1868, so the fishermen had to interpret as best they could the unsatisfactory regulations of 1818. Moreover, the position was rendered worse by an order of the British Government in 1870 to seize all vessels fishing in British waters.

Thus in 1870, in addition to the dangers presented by the Russian high-handed repudiation of the Black Sea neutrality, the British Government was confronted by dangers from an acute stage of American discontent owing to this accumulation of unsatisfied points of dispute between the two countries.

In the previous year the American situation had been somewhat eased by the unofficial negotiations of Mr. Caleb Cushing and Mr. John Rose, afterwards Sir John Rose. Both men had been arbitrators for the Hudson Bay Company and the Home Government with regard to certain lands in dispute with the United States, and consequently understood the facts of the differences between the two countries. Moreover, Cushing was a personal friend of Mr. Hamilton Fish, the American Secretary of State, and Rose was the Canadian Minister for Finance. The two happened to be dining with Mr. Fish, and suggested, as a way out of the difficulty, that Great Britain should make some kind of expression of regret to the United States for her behaviour during the Civil War.² Further, Rose visited England and talked the matter over with prominent men. Consequently, in 1869, there were two negotiations proceeding—the official and the unofficial.

Seizing the opportunity of the Franco-German War, and the strained British and Russian relations in the matter of the Black Sea neutrality, General Grant, in his message to Congress, alluded in sharp terms to the still unsatisfied claims between the United States and Great Britain. In consequence, the British Government made a further effort to come to an understanding, and sent over Sir John Rose to Washington. Sir John obtained another interview with Mr. Fish, who consulted his colleagues, and especially Mr. Sumner. Sumner, however, was still obdurate in his preposterous demand for the withdrawal of Great Britain from America and American waters. Fortunately Fish was not of Sumner's view, and an estrangement arose between the two men. Consequently, when General Grant, who had designs on Cuba scarcely consonant with outraged innocence over "premature recognition", did

¹ Walpole's *History of Twenty-five Years*, Vol. III, p. 58.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 84.

not approve of such extravagant claims, Sumner had no other course left to him but to resign.

Preliminary difficulties being thus dispelled, Sir John Rose's offer was accepted, and it was decided to hold a joint High Commission at Washington. This commission eventually met in that city in the spring of 1871, and was composed of the American representatives, Fish, General Schenck, Nelson, and Hoare, while those from Great Britain were Lord de Grey, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Professor Bernard. The meetings were held in a spirit of great friendliness, and after the initial difficulties of deciding an interpretation of international law to suit the British case, seeing that the Foreign Enlistment Act of 1870 had been passed long after the *Alabama* events, it was "proposed to lay down rules for the guidance of the arbitrators which should be assumed to have been in force during the war". The British representatives gave an expression of their regret for the doings of the *Alabama*, and, as a sop to American feelings, abandoned a claim for indemnity for the Fenian raids into Canada.

With a spirit of goodwill prevailing, the Treaty of Washington was soon drawn up, whereby it was agreed to submit the claims with regard to the *Alabama* to six arbitrators appointed by Great Britain, the United States, Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil. At the same time other matters in dispute were dealt with. It was agreed that for ten years, with a notice of two years on either side, American fishermen might take and cure fish on the coasts of British North America, while British fishermen were to have equal rights in American waters north of the 39th parallel. As the British contended that their concession was the more valuable, it was agreed that a special commission should decide on some compensation to Great Britain for this privilege. It was further agreed that the last outstanding matter, that of the ownership of the Island of San Juan, should be referred to the arbitration of the German emperor.

Unfortunately, owing to a mutual desire to please, in the drafting of the treaty there was a use of an ambiguity of terms which almost led to a breaking off of negotiations. From the very first the American commissioners had taken a much larger view of the general claim—that is to say, the vexed question of the indirect claims for "premature recognition"—than the English representatives, who were under the impression that the "indirect claims" had been abandoned. By one of the clauses of the treaty it was agreed that the claims must be filed by 15 April, and the arbitrators would meet to hear arguments by 15 June. The arbitrators met for the first time at Geneva during December, and the court was constituted as follows:—

United States	Hon. Charles Adams.
Great Britain	Sir Alexander Cockburn (with a brief to Sir Roundell Palmer—Lord Selborne).
Italy	Count Sclopis.
Switzerland	M. Staempfli.
Brazil	Viscount Itajuba.

Welding of the British Empire

When the American claims were published it was discovered that the secretary to the commission, Mr. Bancroft Davies, had inserted the preposterous "indirect claims" which the English commissioners had thought withdrawn. Great indignation and excitement prevailed, and Mr. Gladstone made a very strong speech against the American commissioners, in which he remarked that the American claims looked like exceeding the British National Debt. Nevertheless the diplomatic conversations between the two countries were correct, and the British Government lodged a counter-claim confining the issue to claims for direct losses. But when the arbitrators met in June an understanding was as far off as ever. In fact, Sir Alexander Cockburn, the British arbitrator, was so sure that nothing could come of the meeting that he had not wasted time in studying his brief. But eventually a solution was found through the sterling common sense and goodwill of the American arbitrator, Mr. Charles Adams. His advice was "that the court should spontaneously, without protest or requirement from either side, declare the Indirect Claims to be outside the scope of international law".¹ As it will be remembered that in the *pourparlers* it had been agreed to lay down imaginary rules of international law for the guidance of the arbitrators, Mr. Adams's suggestion was a solution of the difficulty that could be diplomatically accepted. This great stumbling-block having been removed, the arbitrators were able to get to work, and with astonishing celerity they declared their award. A judgment was declared against Great Britain in the case of the *Alabama* and the *Florida*, and certain damages were allowed with regard to the *Shenandoah*. Some claims against smaller vessels were disallowed, and an award of damages of three and a quarter millions sterling was given to the United States (September, 1872). The arbitration in the matter of the San Juan boundary dispute also went against the British, for the German emperor unhesitatingly declared in favour of the United States.

These awards were a bitter disappointment to Great Britain, and it was felt that the Government, in giving way to American clamour, had lowered the national prestige. The general opinion at the time was that arbitration had cost the nation dear; but that is not the verdict of to-day. The good sense of both Governments had saved a situation that had become acute from developing into a bitter *casus belli*. "To have settled a quarrel which was growing more bitter every year, and to have given the world an example of the way in which civilized nations should close their differences, were achievements not estimable in gold and silver. So far from England having tarnished her national honour, she had enhanced its lustre and renown."²

The foreign relations between Great Britain and the United States remained excellent until in 1895 the dispute over the boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela, which had been in existence for forty

¹ Paul's *History of Modern England*, Vol. III, p. 291.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 294.

years, and had entailed voluminous correspondence on the part of successive Foreign Ministers, almost led to a rupture between the two countries. This boundary dispute originated in 1814, when a large portion of the Dutch possessions in South America were taken over by the British. Great Britain laid claim to being the heir of Holland, and Venezuela of Spain. Each country claimed the same territory for boundary, and, roughly speaking, the dispute resolved itself into a contention for the possession of the Essequibo River Basin; the Venezuelans maintaining that naturally, and by age-long tradition, the River Essequibo had been considered the dividing-line. The original dividing-line which guided British claims had been recommended by Sir Robert Schomburgk on his survey of 1842-3, but this frontier had never been acknowledged by the Venezuelans.

Great Britain's relations with the republic had always been troubled, owing to the vicissitudes of Venezuelan politics, and especially to the treatment of British subjects, the financial obligations to whom the Venezuelan Government would not or could not meet. Matters reached a climax by the Venezuelan authorities arresting some members of the British Guiana police on the charge of exercising their calling illegally in Venezuelan territory. The Venezuelans then proceeded to intrigue with Washington, by dangling before the president's eyes the menace of British interference with their independence.

To the amazement of this country President Cleveland professed to see an infringement of the Monroe Doctrine in the British attitude, and issued a strong declaration to Congress, in which the president made the pronouncement that "the United States claimed the right to a predominant voice in any territorial dispute on the American continent",¹ and he further asked for leave to send a commission to Venezuela to examine on the spot the claims of both parties. Great Britain was further invited to submit her claims to the arbitration of the United States, an offer which was promptly refused. The result was an ugly exhibition of Anglophobia throughout the United States.

This action of the president gave rise to an extraordinary outburst of British anger, which now, even after the lapse of only a few years, seems difficult to understand, except perhaps in the light of the acuteness of American rivalry at that time, both in the world of business and of sport. The affair reached the dignity of a *casus belli*, and the British fleet was held in readiness. Fortunately the tried abilities of Lord Salisbury were at the service of the Foreign Office, and, mindful of the nature of American politics, with recurring changes of presidents, he met President Cleveland in a manner that was suave but firm, being convinced that his bark was worse than his bite.

Lord Salisbury accepted the principle of arbitration, and a court of arbitration eventually met in Paris. The award when given was very much in favour of the British claims, as it only modified in certain places the original dividing-line of Schomburgk.

Good came out of this little storm in the diplomatic tea-cup, for

¹ Gretton's *Modern History of the English People*, Vol. 1, p. 382.

the principle of arbitration of points of difference between Great Britain and the United States has become a fixed principle, as much outside the pale of party politics as the maintenance of a preponderant navy.

CHAPTER III

THE IMPERIALISM OF DISRAELI

The general election of 1874 proved one of the most remarkable in British annals, both for its result and the fact that Benjamin Disraeli, the most picturesque and inscrutable statesman of modern times, had at last, after patiently waiting for forty years, realized his dream of power.

The result of the election was remarkable, inasmuch as it was fought for the first time under the new Ballot Act, which was regarded as a distinct advantage to the Liberal party, and yet it returned the Conservatives to power with the biggest majority they had enjoyed for forty years. To the upsetting of preconsidered notions, it was discovered that the British working-man could be a Tory when he felt that his country's interests required it of him. In any case the triumph of Disraeli was complete; the eccentricities of youth and peculiarities of temperament had been forgotten, and at last he possessed the entire confidence of the nation.

Apart from the dazzling nature of Disraeli's campaign, the unpopularity of Gladstone's administration had contributed to the result. The people considered that too much had been attempted, and felt uneasy about the fate of certain cherished institutions and the curtailing of personal liberties by a too zealous and parental Government. The ministry, in their attempt to banish every form of privilege in a hurry, had probably exceeded their mandate. But the chief cause for discontent with the strongest Government of modern times, as it had been styled, undoubtedly lay with the character of Gladstone's foreign policy. That policy had been conducted on the lines of sanity and safety, but had been painfully lacking in spirit and imagination. The result of the Black Sea Conference and the award of the *Alabama* arbitration had been deeply resented. The attitude of non-intervention, and almost timidity, which prevailed in our foreign policy at that time was felt to have lowered us in the eyes of Europe. Moreover, the opinion was prevalent that Continental nations were jealous of Great Britain, while the actions of Russia were causing suspicion.

Disraeli, the most astute politician of his age, had gauged the popular mind well. He perceived that the nation was calling for more activity abroad and less at home. A master of electioneering strategy, for some time he had been rallying the Conservative party, and raising it from its despondency to a new hope, under the emblazoned standard of imperialism. In a speech at the Crystal Palace of characteristic brilliancy and raillery he denounced the Liberal party for the apathy of



Benjamin Disraeli

BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD

From a photograph by W. & D. Downey

their colonial policy, which, he declared, was based on the assumption that the colonies—and even India—were a burden to the taxpayer of this country. He called the people to the standard of imperialism, stating that the Tory party, in addition to guarding sacred institutions at home, was pledged to the maintenance of the empire. He worked his audience up to enthusiasm by his famous words: "Will you be content to be a comfortable England on Continental principles, or will you be a great imperial country—a country where your sons, when they rise, rise to paramount positions, and obtain not merely the esteem of their country, but command the respect of the world?"

There is no doubt that the ideas of modern imperialism owe their origin to Disraeli. He was the first minister of the crown to fire the popular imagination with the value of her over-sea possessions to the mother country. His imperialism, in spite of the accusation of opportunism which its initiation evoked, bore the stamp of sincerity. He dreamed of the greatness of Great Britain, and such an attitude was natural to him, for he loved splendid dominance, whether of race or family, as his books bear witness. But mostly, to his mind, the word empire meant the East. A Jew by birth, the mystery and glamour of the East had a natural attraction for him, and he saw in India the brightest jewel of the British dominions. His policy with regard to India was a forward one, as he had the greatest fear of Russian encroachment in Afghanistan, with its threatening invasion of the Indian frontier. In Lord Lytton he found a viceroy capable of understanding his views. By way of cementing the goodwill of the Indian people, on his advice the Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII of happy memory, made a state progress through the empire. The visit was carried out with great pomp and splendour, and the prince was received largely with great enthusiasm, but always with becoming respect. The forward policy, as we shall see, was open to much criticism, and on the return of the Liberals to power was reversed; but undoubtedly it had this advantage: it showed that the empire was a virile institution, and that British words meant British deeds. The forward policy atoned for the Black Sea Conference and cast a shadow on German diplomacy; for it must be remembered that St. Petersburg was still under the ascendancy of Berlin.

But to a man of Disraeli's dramatic instinct the proudest moment of his Eastern policy must have been when he offered the imperial title to Queen Victoria in 1876. To us, after this lapse of time, it seems strange that, taking into consideration the character of our Indian occupation, there should have been a controversy over granting this title of Empress of India. But such was the case. There was a feeling that the title was too autocratic for British ears and savoured too much of militarism and ostentation. However, the Bill authorizing the Government to grant this dignity passed both houses without an adverse vote, and Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India on 1 May, 1876; and in the autumn of the same year Mr. Disraeli passed to the House of Lords as Earl of Beaconsfield.

Welding of the British Empire

If the bestowing of the imperial dignity upon his queen was a source of personal gratification to Lord Beaconsfield, in the eyes of the people the most solid triumph of his administration was his masterly purchase of the khedive's shares in the Suez Canal. This famous undertaking, constructed by the genius of the ill-fated De Lesseps, had been opened for traffic in 1869, and, by a strangely perverted view, its construction had received no support from Great Britain, but, on the contrary, opposition. British opinion was jealous about its sea-borne traffic via the Cape. In 1876 the extravagances of the khedive, Ismail Pasha, both with regard to national and personal expenditure, had reached such enormous proportions that something had to be done to meet even a portion of the liabilities. The only immediately realizable assets possessed by the khedive were his holding of Suez Canal shares, almost amounting to half of the original issue. He decided to sell the shares, and was casting about for, if possible, a French purchaser, when the tip concerning these negotiations reached Mr. Frederick Greenwood, an English journalist of brilliant capacity. Mr. Greenwood rushed post-haste to Lord Beaconsfield, and, fortunately obtaining an immediate interview, pointed out to him how exceedingly disastrous in its eventual consequences the transference of these shares to a foreign Government might be for this country. The Suez Canal was the gateway to India. Lord Beaconsfield's Eastern conscience was at once aroused; the gravity of the position was clear to him. The only danger lay in the fact that, perhaps, after all, the news was not true. This possibility he determined to risk; so he wired immediately to the British agent in Cairo to make personal enquiries of the khedive. The news was confirmed, and Lord Beaconsfield, without even consulting his colleagues in the cabinet, purchased the shares for four millions sterling. Lord Beaconsfield's action has justly been regarded as one of the boldest strokes of British statecraft, and of incalculable value to the empire. In the words of Doctor Holland Rose, it was "an affair which may prove to have been scarcely less important in a political sense than Nelson's victory at the Nile".

The forward policy of Lord Beaconsfield has been the subject of fierce controversy and the strict adherence to British Turcophil tradition was to lead to its reversal. But, however opinion may differ about his policy, the fact remains that it was conceived by a great mind which taught the British nation to be great. Dark moments there have been in our subsequent history, but the lessons taught by Lord Beaconsfield have been learnt. Henceforth the British had to be an imperial people, conscious of their responsibility and their destiny. It is significant that on the Continent—at the Congress of Berlin he dwarfed the great Bismarck himself—Lord Beaconsfield was regarded as the greatest English statesman since Palmerston, and to-day his laurels are still green when those of many before and after him have faded.

CHAPTER IV

THE EASTERN QUESTION AND THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN

To avert the horrors of a European war the signatories to the Treaty of Paris, 1856, had maintained the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, but their support was conditional on the promise of Turkey to reform herself, and especially to redress the grievances of her Christian subjects, who were groaning under persecution, tyranny, and misrule. The sultan, as usual, was ready enough with promises which he was unwilling or unable to keep, and whenever a diplomatic crisis occurred continued to rely on French and British intervention in his favour. Consequently the warning of the Black Sea Conference of 1871 was quite unheeded by the Government of the Porte.

The inevitable happened. Early in 1875 a rebellion arose among the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who were goaded beyond endurance by agrarian wrongs and the impositions of the tax-farmers. The secret influence of Russian sympathy with the insurgents made its mark, and the rebellion began to prove too much for the impoverished Ottoman exchequer. Austria dreaded the rising of her own Slav millions; accordingly, in conjunction with Russia and Germany, Count Andrassy addressed a note to the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy, proposing a scheme of reforms to be imposed upon the sultan. The Andrassy note proposed: (1) establishment of religious toleration, (2) abolition of the iniquitous tax-farming, (3) a scheme of agrarian improvements, (4) a system of graduated local taxation, and (5) the appointment of a commission composed of Moslems and Christians to enforce the carrying out of the reforms.


The Andrassy note was received by Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Derby, his Foreign Minister, with a frigid assent; the terms of the note were considered by both statesmen as inopportune. Moreover, Lord Beaconsfield, partly by racial bias and partly by his conception of imperial and especially Indian needs, was a staunch supporter of the traditional policy of upholding Ottoman integrity; in which policy he had the support and approval of Queen Victoria. To the veiled amusement of the world the note was accepted by the sultan himself. Conscious of the mutual jealousy of the Great Powers, and especially of Great Britain and Russia, the Porte would have cheerfully promised anything.

The futility of the note was a foregone conclusion. The Turks pigeonholed it for future reference and the rebellion spread. Bulgaria joined in the revolt and was treated with the most abominable cruelty. The Porte had lost complete control of its subjects, and events culminated in the murder of the French and German consuls at Salonika. Both countries at once sent squadrons to Turkish waters, and representatives of the three emperors met at Berlin. Prince Bismarck, with

the assistance of Prince Gortschakoff and Count Andrassy, drew up a memorandum, to be known henceforth as the Berlin Memorandum, demanding an armistice of two months to enable the refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina to return home, together with the establishment of a mixed commission to see to their repatriation. The note was accepted by France and Italy, but Great Britain refused "to accept a plan, in the preparation of which it had not been consulted, and which it did not believe would succeed".

Lord Beaconsfield was suspicious of Russian intrigue, and perceived too marked an eagerness on the part of Gortschakoff to resort to coercion. Meanwhile a successful palace rising under Midhat Pasha, a liberal in favour of constitutional changes, had deposed that weakly sultan, Abdul Aziz, and his nephew, Murad Effendi, was raised to the throne as Murad V. He in turn fell to a second palace revolution, and for many years the Porte and outside world were to feel the sway of the able but sinister Abdul Hamid.

There seemed a hope of Turkish reformation until the news of the atrocities perpetrated on the Bulgarians reached England. A storm of indignation arose throughout the country and the Turkophil policy of Lord Beaconsfield became exceedingly unpopular. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the advice of the British ambassador, Sir Henry Elliot, at Constantinople, had indirectly strengthened the Turkish hands in suppressing revolution; but of course no one could have imagined that tendering the advice of a firm policy would be interpreted into licence and atrocity. Sir Henry Elliot directed a vigorous protest to the Porte, but the Government's policy received a rude check by the light way in which Disraeli, on the eve of becoming Lord Beaconsfield, brushed away the news of the Bulgarian massacres in a debate in the House of Commons as "coffee-house babble". This remark will stand for all time for the detractors of the great statesman, as much as the famous statement "peace with honour" will remain for his admirers. But undoubtedly there may have been room for honest doubt concerning the complete truth of the atrocities, until the report of Mr. Evelyn Baring, afterwards Earl of Cromer, who had been sent out to the East on a special commission of enquiry, was published. Mr. Baring's report revealed the whole hideous truth. Mr. Gladstone emerged from his retirement at Hawarden and published his famous pamphlet, couched in noble language and vivid phrase, on the Bulgarian horrors. This pamphlet, and the publication of the Baring report, excited public opinion to the full. Everywhere meetings were held denouncing the unspeakable Turk, and one meeting which took place at St. James's Hall was remarkable for the support offered to it by men of leading and genius. There were present philanthropists like the Duke of Westminster and Lord Shaftesbury, and men eminent in the arts like William Morris, Browning, Ruskin, and Burne-Jones. The sage of Chelsea sent an approving letter, couched in characteristic terms. "The unspeakable Turk should be immediately struck out of the question and the country left to honest European guidance, the



W. E. Gladstone

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE

From a photograph (taken about 1874) by the London Stereoscopic Co.

delaying of which can be profitable or agreeable only to gamblers on the Stock Exchange, but distressing and unprofitable to all other men."

The excitement penetrated to the House of Commons, and the supporters of Mr. Gladstone were vehement in their denunciation of the Government's Turkophil policy. But Mr. Disraeli stood his ground manfully; he defended his policy on the grounds of its Eastern exigency and the necessity of upholding the integrity of the Turkish Empire. He did not uphold Turkish morals, but British interests. It was his last speech in the House of Commons, and that House which had refused to listen to his first must have felt the greatness of his closing words. "What our duty is at this critical moment is to maintain the empire of England. Nor will we ever agree to any step, though it may obtain for a moment comparative quiet and a false prosperity, that hazards the existence of that empire." At any rate it was a fearless confession of faith.

But if Lord Beaconsfield was disinclined to relinquish the traditional policy he was determined that Turkey should know her true position. Lord Derby, as Foreign Minister, sent a dispatch to Sir Henry Elliot at Constantinople containing a vigorous protest, in which Sir Henry was to declare to the sultan that his conduct had alienated the sympathy of the concert of Europe, and how difficult it might become for British diplomacy to uphold the Porte.

The effect of Great Britain's rejection of the Berlin Memorandum was to draw the three emperors closer together. On 8 July the emperors of Austria and Russia met privately at Reichstadt, the meeting being an immense success from the Russian point of view; for the Tsar came away with the promise of Austrian neutrality in case of war. The situation had, meantime, become worse by the sudden plunging of Serbia and Montenegro into the fray. The attitude of Prince Milan of Serbia was exceedingly unwise; moreover, he had acted contrary to the advice of the Powers, and especially of Great Britain. In spite of the assistance of countless Russian volunteers, and the able leadership of the Russian general, Tchernayeff, the Serbians were badly beaten and at once appealed to the Powers for mediation. Through the mediation of Great Britain Abdul Hamid proposed an armistice of six months, but the terms were considered by the Russians to be exceedingly harsh to the Serbians and they were rejected. The Eastern crisis had, meanwhile, evoked a strong pan-Slavonic outcry of sympathy from Russia, to which Alexander II was forced to bow. Accordingly he dispatched General Ignatieff to Constantinople, who demanded reasonable terms for the insurgents, couched in very peremptory tones. Abdul Hamid at once complied and an armistice of eight weeks was granted.

By this time the attitude of Russia was beginning to be suspected by Great Britain, a fact which caused the popular Turcophobia to cool a little. Alexander II was exceedingly anxious to placate British opinion, and he assured our ambassador at St. Petersburg that he

had no designs on Constantinople. Such assurances, and the British proposal of a conference at Constantinople to discuss the whole question, seemed to promise better hopes of joint action against Turkish misrule. But such hopes were destined to be dashed to the ground by Lord Beaconsfield's warlike speech at the Guild-hall, on Lord Mayor's Day, in which he threatened Russia with the memorable words: "In a righteous cause, England will commence a fight that will not end until right is done".

The emperor took the threat to heart and 160,000 Russian troops were mobilized. Russia was by this time openly pro-Serbian. But British diplomacy had its way and the conference duly met at Constantinople on 23 December, 1877. This conference has been described as a farce; certainly a hilarious note was struck when Abdul Hamid, to the booming of cannon and the huzzas of a well-drilled populace, proclaimed a constitution for Turkey under the fatherly care of the liberal Midhat Pasha. The skilled diplomatists, used to the ways of the Turk, with difficulty repressed their laughter. Lord Salisbury, the British representative, showed his appreciation of the joke by withdrawing the fleet from Besika Bay. The sultan, of course, hid behind his new constitution. The constitution, given time, would perform miracles for Turkey, in the meantime he was going to promise nothing. The demands of the conference were moderate: Serbia and Montenegro to remain where they were and a measure of self-government to be accorded to Bosnia and Herzegovina. General Ignatieff stated that Russia was prepared to accept any arrangement that afforded protection to the Christian population, but she preferred a military occupation. Such an occupation was strenuously opposed by Lord Salisbury. As was to be expected, the conference at once came to an end, finding a reason for its dissolution in an inability to come to terms about guarantees. Shortly afterwards the curtain fell on the Turkish Constitution; it had never got beyond a dress rehearsal. Midhat Pasha, proving recalcitrant, was eventually disposed of in Oriental fashion.

Prince Gortschakoff at once issued a circular to the Powers to ask what they proposed to do. In Britain there was a great division of opinion, even in the Liberal ranks, but Russia never wavered in her intention to protect the Christian subjects of the sultan. Alexander II made a final effort to preserve peace: he sent General Ignatieff to the courts of Europe to gauge opinion and state the Russian case. Ignatieff, with the help of Count Schouvaloff, the Russian ambassador in London, drew up a protocol which eventually Lord Beaconsfield signed. The protocol, after narrating the efforts of the Powers for the improvement of the lot of the Christians in Turkey and acknowledging the promises of reform already made by the Porte, although ignoring the new Turkish constitution, reserved to itself the right to take steps to secure the well-being of the Christian populations.

Abdul Hamid promptly rejected the protocol on the ground that it was inconsistent with the Treaty of Paris, and a fortnight later

Russia declared war. The war was regarded with mixed feeling in Great Britain; there was a great deal of genuine sympathy for the plight of the Christian nations in the Balkans, but there was also considerable suspicion of Russia. Mr. Gladstone was violent in his denunciation of the Turk: "The destruction may not come in the way or by the means that we should choose, but, come from what hands it may, I am persuaded that it will be accepted as a boon by Christendom and by the world". The Government's reply to this eloquence was correct: it would support neither side unless British interests were attacked.

The course of the war will be followed in another section of this book, so it only concerns us here to note its effect upon British opinion. When, after the many vicissitudes of an arduous and hazardous campaign, the victorious Russians burst through the Shipka Pass into the plains of Rumelia, the Turks saw that further resistance was hopeless, and, as is their wont under such circumstances, sought the mediation of the Powers. Queen Victoria especially was appealed to, and she telegraphed personally to Alexander II.

The reply was probably not satisfactory; at any rate the fleet was ordered to the Dardanelles, although the destination was immediately changed to Besika Bay. There was a variety of opinion in the Cabinet, which, roughly, divided itself into two groups, the first, warlike at any costs, undoubtedly had the sympathy of the prime minister, and the second only warlike if Constantinople were in danger.

Meanwhile the Russian peace terms were published and proved to be moderate in tone, bearing on the surface little evidence of a desire for aggrandizement. Bulgaria was to be a tributary province of the Porte, while Serbia, Rumania, and Montenegro were to be independent, and Home Rule was to be accorded to Bosnia and Herzegovina. But to the British Government the sting lay in the conclusion of the Russian demands: in addition to a money indemnity the recognition of her rights in the Bosphorus and Dardanelles. The tendency of their demand, if granted, would be to convert the Black Sea into a Russian lake, to give them the mastery of the straits, and threaten the Eastern dominions of Great Britain.

There was a general outcry, and the unspeakable Turk was almost forgiven in the suspicion aroused by the Russian. Sir Stafford Northcote asked for a credit note of six millions, which met with considerable opposition. But this opposition during the debate changed to support owing to a sensational telegram from the British ambassador, Mr. Layard, saying that the Russians were advancing on Constantinople.


An official denial was sent by the British ambassador at St. Petersburg, inspired by Prince Gortschakoff, but the British Government continued their preparations, and a portion of the fleet was ordered to enter the Sea of Marmora, ostensibly for the reason of defending British subjects. The emperor parried with the ironical threat of entering Constantinople for the protection of the Christians there if the fleet passed the Dardanelles. War seemed imminent on a philanthropic

quibble. Fortunately better sense prevailed, and Lord Beaconsfield ordered the fleet to remain outside the Sea of Marmora. Both sides marked time while they continued their preparations. In the meanwhile the Russians had signed a treaty with the Turks on 3 March, 1878, at San Stefano. The news of this treaty had a sobering effect on English jingoism. By this treaty the independence of Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania was recognized. Bulgaria was to be autonomous, with a tributary prince, and her dominions were to be enlarged, with a port on the Ægean Sea and an army of occupation of 50,000 men for two years. Rumania was to exchange Bessarabia for the Dobrudja, while Batoum, Ardahan, Kars, and Bayazid, and an indemnity of fourteen hundred million roubles fell to Russia's share.

But the signing of the Treaty of San Stefano had by no means smoothed Russian difficulties. There was considerable indignation in the Balkans at Russian and Bulgar excesses, and the Moslems of the Rhodope Mountains rose in revolt. Further, Rumania was so furious at the signing of the treaty without her consent, that Prince Charles pacified public anger at the exchange of Bessarabia with considerable difficulty. It was left to Austria to put pressure upon Russia by mobilizing on the Carpathian frontier, and suggesting that the conditions of the Treaty of San Stefano should be laid before a congress of Europe. Vienna was at first suggested, but the urgent invitation of Bismarck, who volunteered to act as "honest broker", caused Berlin to be appointed as the place of meeting. In agreeing to a congress Prince Gortschakoff would only pledge his Government "to accept a discussion of those portions of the treaty which affected European interests". The British Government demanded that the whole treaty should be laid upon the table for discussion. There seemed no way of bridging over the difficulties, and the relations between Great Britain and Russia daily grew worse. Lord Beaconsfield called out the reserves and summoned 7000 Indian troops to Malta. These measures were considered too drastic by Lord Derby, who accordingly resigned, and was succeeded by Lord Salisbury.

Lord Salisbury immediately sent a masterly dispatch to the Powers urging the necessity of a congress, and pointing out the objections to the treaty of San Stefano. The conclusion he reached was that the treaty threatened the peace of Europe and that it should be discussed in its entirety. Prince Gortschakoff replied firmly and courteously, but declined to yield; although he instructed Count Schouvaloff to make secret enquiries with Lord Beaconsfield's cabinet to discover what concessions they were likely to grant. The Count found that the large Bulgaria was a scheme that was exceedingly distasteful to British diplomacy, and that if Russia would consent to exclude Bulgaria from the Ægean, restore the Balkan frontier to the sultan as well as Bayazid, Great Britain would raise no objection to the cession of Bessarabia as well as Batoum, Kars, and Ardahan, and would agree to the essentials of the Treaty of San Stefano.

Lord Beaconsfield, disliking the Armenian policy of Russia, on



Mehemet Ali
Pasha

Lord
Salisbury

Count Schuwaloff

Count Andrassy Prince Bismarck

Count Károly Prince Gortschakoff Lord Beaconsfield

THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN, 1878

4 June, 1878, made a secret convention with Turkey, quite unknown to St. Petersburg, though a hint had been given in the negotiations with Schouvaloff, by which he promised aid to the Turks if the Russians sought further territory in Asia Minor. In consideration for this promise the sultan granted to Great Britain the Isle of Cyprus on the payment of an annual tribute as a hostage for Russian possessions.

Thus the congress opened on 13 June, but although Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury left for Berlin to a fanfare of trumpets, the secret treaties had leaked out through the *Globe*, though stoutly denied by the ministry, and the congress was recognized as a farce. Before he entered the council-room, Lord Beaconsfield, the friend of Turkey, had endorsed the "bag and baggage" policy and sold his vote to Gortschakoff.

But even with the secret treaties in their pockets the two antagonists, Russia and Great Britain, found it difficult to come to terms, and Prince Bismarck required all that *bonhomie* he could assume when necessary to steer the ship into harbour. The Treaty of Berlin was signed on 13 July, and differed in very little from that signed at San Stefano. Bulgaria was confined to a smaller area, and the southern portion was formed into the province of East Rumelia, under the direct authority of the sultan. Bosnia and Herzegovina were handed to Austria, under a protectorate. Serbia and Montenegro became independent, with some slight territorial additions. Russia obtained Batoum and Kars. In fact, only Austria and Russia benefited by the treaty. Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury were fêted on their return, bringing with them "peace with honour". On the Continent Lord Beaconsfield's policy was regarded as a triumph for English diplomacy.

But in the light of recent knowledge it has transpired how Beaconsfield, with his traditional friendship for the Turk, missed a golden opportunity. Bismarck from the first perceived that Egypt might disturb the peace in the Near East, and proposed that Great Britain should annex it. Beaconsfield refused, and came away with Cyprus, burdened with a payment of a tribute to the sultan. "Had Lord Beaconsfield followed up his popular and sagacious purchase of the khedive's shares in the Suez Canal by adding Egypt to the dominions of the queen, he might have defied his opponents to do their worst."¹

CHAPTER V

AFGHANISTAN AND THE FORWARD POLICY

Smarting from her diplomatic defeat at Berlin in 1878, and the wresting from her of the spoils of victory, Russia determined on greater activity in Central Asia to undermine the prestige of Great Britain in those regions. In fact, it was some time before she could forgive Great

¹ Paul's *Modern England*, Vol. III.

Britain's share in the humiliation to which she considered she had been subjected, and desist from that policy of pin-pricks on the flanks of our Indian north-west frontier, the effects of which is still recent history.

The traditional policy of the Indian Council since the disastrous failure to establish a residency in Kabul in 1842 had been one of non-interference in Afghan affairs. On the death of Dost Mohammed, who had proved faithful to the British, he was succeeded by his third son, Shere Ali, and a civil war of five years ensued. During this period the viceroy, Sir John Lawrence, afterwards Lord Lawrence, had maintained a policy of masterly inactivity, and on Shere Ali emerging from the struggle victorious, recognized him as ameer, and saw to it that he received the customary British subsidies. In 1869 Lord Mayo, the successor to Lord Lawrence, met Shere Ali at Umballah. The ameer, who was alarmed at the rapid advance of the Russians, desired a close alliance with Great Britain, but, out of respect to the fiercely independent Afghan nature, would not consent to receive a permanent British embassy. Lord Mayo was stanch to the Lawrence policy and refused an alliance, but promised not to press for the reception of a British resident at Kabul in return for a reciprocal rejection of foreign interference, and especially from Russia, in what amounted to a British sphere of influence. When in turn Lord Mayo gave way to Lord Northbrook, the new viceroy endorsed the policy of an independent, strong Afghanistan. In fact this policy had practically become a creed of the Indian Council.

But on the accession of Lord Beaconsfield there sprang into being a new forward policy, advocated by capable administrators like Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Henry Rawlinson, and dear to the imperialist heart of the prime minister himself. Convinced by the soundness of the advice of a strong memorandum from Sir Bartle Frere, Lord Salisbury, the new Indian Secretary, in a dispatch to the viceroy in 1875, advocated the establishment of English agents at Quetta, Kandahar, Herat, and even Kabul. Lord Salisbury considered such agencies necessary for the procuring of accurate information with regard to Central Asian affairs. Lord Northbrook, true to his convictions, promptly resigned, and Lord Beaconsfield appointed an enthusiastic apostle of the forward policy, the Earl of Lytton.

Lord Lytton at once took up the policy of the home Government, and dispatched Sir Richard Pollock, the commissioner at Peshawar, to Shere Ali, to announce the conferring on Queen Victoria of the dignity of Empress of India, and to propose that the ameer should receive Sir Lewis Pelley to discuss matters of common interest.

The ameer replied evasively, and stated that most matters of moment had been discussed in the meeting with Lord Mayo in 1873, but offered to send his own agent. Lord Lytton, considering the reply disrespectful, sent the ameer a second letter, in which he declined to receive the native agent, and again offered the services of Sir Lewis Pelley. A refusal, the viceroy stated, would be considered a rejection of the

alliance and support of Great Britain, while the reception of Sir Lewis Pelley would enable a meeting to take place later at Peshawar between the ameer and himself.

The viceroy's policy caused a division in the Council, as a portion of the members questioned the honesty of the motive in sending Sir Lewis Pelley, since the real object was the settling of a permanent mission in Afghanistan, while they considered the letter to the ameer equivalent to an ultimatum. Lord Lytton, in a remarkable speech, defended his policy and said he doubted the necessity or wisdom of establishing a permanent agency at Kabul; but he desired to find out the ameer's proposals, and thought it dangerous to wait while Russia was growing stronger in Afghanistan. However, Lord Lytton effected a temporary compromise by Sir Lewis Pelley's receiving Shere Ali's emissary, Atta Mohammed Khan, at Simla. Shere Ali had been discontented with Lord Northbrook because he would give no promise of alliance or support for his heir, his favourite son, Abdullah Khan. Lord Lytton offered the alliance, subsidy, and acknowledgment of Abdullah provided the ameer would give up his Russian leanings and allow a British representative to reside in Afghanistan. But Shere Ali was of weak disposition that inclined to sulkiness, and he still resented the slight of Lord Northbrook's refusal, and consequently was more drawn towards Russia. The meeting proved a complete failure, as the ameer's representatives refused to allow a British agent at Kabul or elsewhere. He pretended that if he allowed a British agent he must allow a Russian one as well. He wanted neither, and thought the life of no European agent, with the rooted Afghan hatred of the foreigner, would be safe at Kabul. Negotiations were accordingly broken off; Lord Lytton informed the ameer that he had forfeited British support, and the native agent was withdrawn from Kabul. Sir Lewis Pelley also left Peshawar, and Major Cavagnari was appointed deputy agent.

Suddenly the startling news reached India that the ameer had received a Russian mission at Kabul. This was Russia's retort for her treatment at Berlin, although, cynically enough, the retort was prompted by Prince Bismarck. Lord Lytton sent a panicky dispatch to Lord Cranbrook, the new minister at the India Office in place of Lord Salisbury, who had accepted the portfolio of foreign affairs, with details of Shere Ali's warlike preparations. As a matter of fact, the viceroy anticipated a war with Russia and wished to facilitate the partition of Afghanistan in accordance with the tenets of the forward policy.

Lord Lytton was precipitate. General Stoletoff, the Russian envoy, arrived at Kabul with the deliberate object of embroiling Afghanistan with Great Britain, and the viceroy walked into the trap. A protest to Kabul met with the reply that the mission could not be revoked, the presence of the Russian envoy at Kabul having once been recognized as an established fact.

Lord Lytton wrote to Lord Cranbrooke proposing the rectification of the north-west frontier and the immediate dispatch of a British minister

to Kabul. An endorsement of his policy being received from home, the viceroy informed the ameer of his intention to send an envoy, and, without waiting for a reply from Kabul, at once dispatched Sir Neville Chamberlain towards the frontier with a considerable escort of 1000 men. Meanwhile the ameer's heir, Abdullah Khan, had died, and a letter of condolence preceded Sir Neville Chamberlain's arrival at Peshawar. The British envoy stayed a few days at Peshawar and then proceeded to Jamrad on the frontier.

Meanwhile Major Cavagnari, having advanced before the Chamberlain mission to prepare the way, had arrived at Ali Musjid, and was met by Faiz Mohammed Khan, the representative of the ameer. Major Cavagnari informed Faiz Mohammed that the expedition desired to proceed through the Khyber Pass; but permission was somewhat curtly refused, and, on his arrival, Sir Neville Chamberlain could, under the circumstances, only return to Peshawar.

This rebuff to the Indian Government could not be allowed to pass unnoticed; it was too severe a humiliation for British diplomacy. There was an outcry at home and in India, and troops were at once assembled on the frontier. The voice of Lord Lawrence was heard in vain; he inveighed against molesting a country which only desired to be left alone, and received the support of many Anglo-Indians, including Sir John Gedge and Sir Henry Havelock. Lord Lytton communicated with the India Office, and advised the immediate declaration of war and the deposition of Shere Ali.

Consequently an ultimatum was sent to the ameer demanding an apology for the treatment meted to Sir Neville Chamberlain and the promise of the establishment of a permanent British legation not later than 20 November. At the Guild-hall Lord Beaconsfield made an aggressive speech, and voiced the opinion of the so-called Sindh school of Indian officials. The prime minister declared the frontier was haphazard and should be scientific. The "scientific frontier" became a password to a forward policy of aggression the wisdom of which was severely criticized. However, Lord Beaconsfield believed in the necessity of a forward movement to preserve the Indian Empire from Russian aggression, and, in somewhat brusque fashion, refused to receive a peace deputation from the great Indian consul, Lord Lawrence. In his opinion, the pacific policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Northbrook had led to the present impasse.

The ameer took refuge in silence; no reply was given to the British ultimatum. An expeditionary force was at once dispatched from India in three detachments under the command of Generals Stewart, Frederick Roberts, and Samuel Browne. General Browne captured Ali Musjid and occupied Jellalabad, while Sir Frederick Roberts advanced through the Kyber Pass to Kurum, and established himself in a very strong position on the ridge of Peiwar Kotal. In January, 1879, General Stewart entered Kandahar.

Meanwhile the ameer had dispatched a belated reply to the viceroy, which, had it arrived more promptly in accordance with diplomatic

usage, might have averted the war. Shere Ali made no apology for the reception accorded to Chamberlain, but he agreed to the temporary reception of a British envoy. The opposition seized this chance, and Gladstone was loud in his denunciation of the war. "If Russia sent a mission to Kabul, why had we not called Russia to account?" In the Upper House the premier was subjected to an attack from the upholders of the traditional policy, Lord Lawrence and Lord Grey; but Lord Beaconsfield defended himself in a powerful speech, in which he appreciated the Russian aims as the logical result of the treaty of San Stefano, consequently this country should take her own measures against them, and he denounced his opponents as "upholders of peace at any price".

The success of the British expedition at the outset drove Shere Ali in flight from his capital. He died within a few weeks at Mazâr-i-Sherif. Yakub Khan, a son of Shere Ali, was released from prison by his adherents and acknowledged as regent. But since the death of Shere Ali Afghanistan had lapsed into anarchy, and the tribes would only recognize their independent chiefs. Great Britain, in view of Russian pretensions, was naturally interested in restoring stable rule, and a treaty was concluded at Gandamak, 26 May, 1879, between Yakub Khan and Major Cavagnari (afterwards Sir Louis Cavagnari), by which the control of Afghan foreign policy by Great Britain was recognized and a British representative was permitted at Kabul. There was to be no annexation of territory, but the principle of the "scientific frontier" was in a measure to be granted by handing over the control of Khyber Pass, with the districts of Pishi, Sibi, and Karum, to the Indian Government. In exchange for these concessions the ameer was to receive British support and an annual subsidy of £60,000.

Lord Lytton received the congratulations of the Government for his diplomatic success, and Sir Louis Cavagnari, with a small bodyguard, took up his quarters as resident at Kabul. The news of the invasion of Afghanistan met with a vigorous protest from Lord Lawrence during the few remaining days of his life, while the news of the establishment of the mission at Kabul drew from him the exclamation: "They will all be murdered, every one of them!"

The fulfilment of Lord Lawrence's gloomy forebodings was not long delayed. Lord Lytton's triumph over Russian diplomacy was shortlived; the question of the residency proved the danger, as it always had. The ameer was irritated by the perpetual presence of the resident, and the proud Afghan natives hated and distrusted the foreign occupation. There was a fierce outbreak at the residency, which the ameer, if powerless to control, displayed very little vigour in attempting to quell, and the resident and his suite, after a gallant defence, were all massacred. The policy of Lord Lytton had fallen to the ground like a pack of cards, and that of "masterly inactivity" seemed justified. Fortunately, the British army had not entirely evacuated the country. A punitive force started at once. Sir Donald Stewart reoccupied Kandahar, and Sir Frederick Roberts, marching through the Kurum

Valley, entered Kabul on 12 October, 1879, after defeating the Afghans at Kharasia. General Roberts was amazed to discover how Russianized the city of Kabul had become, and, as he has told us in his book, *Forty-one Years in India*, even the Afghan officers were garbed in Russian uniforms, and the upholders of the "forward policy" could contend that they had saved Afghanistan from becoming a Russian province.

With characteristic energy Sir Frederick Roberts placed Kabul under military law. The ameer was deposed, and a commission appointed to enquire into the murder of the resident. The commission established the negligence of the ameer, and Yakub Khan was deported to India and eighty-seven who were implicated in the plot were condemned, while two Afghan sirdars were punished by deportation to India. Meanwhile the position of General Roberts was highly dangerous; his force was only a small one, while he was surrounded by insurgents, his only line of communication with India being the distant Khyber Pass. A strong body of the tribesmen of Kohistan, after being defeated at Urghandi, reappeared in superior numbers, and Sir Frederick Roberts was obliged to retire from Kabul and fortify himself in Shirpur cantonments. After repulsing several attacks, he managed to re-establish himself in Kabul, where he was eventually reinforced.

It was impossible for the British Government to leave Afghanistan without some strong central rule and release the country from the throes of anarchy and the pretensions of rival chieftains.

Lord Lytton had now reverted to his old policy of a partition of Afghanistan. He thought Afghanistan might be divided into northern and southern kingdoms, and was in favour of Great Britain keeping Kandahar, while Persia might have Seistan and Herat. Mr. Lepel Griffin was sent to Kabul to supersede Lord Roberts as political agent, and he at once announced the Government's scheme of dividing Afghanistan, since no strong ruler could be found for the whole. Such a man was found in the remarkable Abdur Rahman, a grandson of Dost Mohammed. Abdur Rahman had for some little time been a pensioner of Russia in Turkestan, who had taken him up on account of his alleged hatred of the English. He had crossed the Oxus early in 1880 with a few followers, and made himself in a very short time master of Afghan Turkestan. But in opening negotiations it was soon evident that Abdur Rahman had decided views. He desired a united Afghanistan as a neutral state under the protection of Russia and Great Britain, but was met with the statement that the treaty of Gandamak allowed no intervention of a foreign state in Afghan affairs. This statement certainly caused Abdur Rahman to lean more favourably towards the British when negotiations were broken off.

The position, then, was that in the south the Government sought a stronger ruler. In Kandahar, which had by the forward policy been earmarked for Great Britain, a new Shere Ali had been appointed "Wali" or governor, and in the north the redoubtable Abdur Rahman was making good his claim. Sir Donald Stewart was sent to strengthen

MAIWAND: SAVING THE GUNS. From a painting by R. Caton Woodville in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

This picture represents an incident in the Battle of Maiwand, which was fought on 27th July, 1880, during the Second Afghan War. In this battle Ayub Khan inflicted a severe defeat on a British force under General Burrows, and the consequent danger to the British troops in Candahar was only removed after Sir Frederick (later Earl) Roberts had made his famous march from Cabul and routed Ayub Khan.

Richard Caton Woodville is a well-known battle painter of American birth but British extraction, born in 1856. He has had actual experience of warfare.

SAVING THE GUNS, MAIWAND

R. CATON WOODVILLE

Shere Ali, and, after defeating an Afghan force at Ahmed Khel and settling Kandahar, passed on to Kabul.

But at home, in 1880, a general election resulted in the rout of the Conservatives, largely owing to the popular discontent with the "forward policy", which, in spite of a fierce, warlike attitude at the Berlin Congress, and a desire for a "scientific frontier" in India, was considered to have achieved very little of permanent value to the nation, and, moreover, the shadow of South African trouble was impending. The result of the election was the immediate signal for the retirement of Lord Lytton, and the Marquess of Ripon was called to succeed him.

In accordance with tradition, the Liberal party was pacific. It wanted as little as possible that was controversial in its foreign policy, to strengthen what was highly controversial in its domestic programme, and, above all, it wanted to be rid of the Afghan trouble. But it was impossible to leave Afghanistan in a state of civil war, and negotiations were re-opened with Abdur Rahman.

Abdur Rahman was determined to succeed to the entire domains of his grandfather, Dost Mohammed. Moreover, there were difficulties with regard to Kandahar and the subsidy to be paid; but a compromise was effected. Abdur Rahman was proclaimed ameer of northern Afghanistan, Kabul was handed over to him, and a subsidy in laks of rupees amounting to £200,000, the new ameer promising to protect the retirement of the British force from Kabul.

But the peaceable evacuation of Afghanistan was not to be. A rival claimant to the throne, Ayoub Khan, had been gathering his forces in great numbers at Herat, and was advancing on Kandahar. General Primrose had been left in Kandahar with a small force amounting to 5000 men, and General Burrows was directed to march with about half this garrison, amounting to 2300 British and Indian troops, to the Helmand, against Ayoub, with the expectation of assistance from the Wali, Shere Ali. But the whole of Shere Ali's native troops deserted to the cause of Ayoub, and General Burrows was compelled to retreat to Kuski-i-Nakhud. Here he obtained information that the forces of Ayoub were marching through the pass of Maiwand upon Kandahar. Burrows had completely underrated the strength of the enemy and gave battle with a ludicrously inadequate force. The result was a disastrous defeat to the British arms. The British fought with great gallantry, but the Indian troops broke and fled. With the utmost difficulty Burrows led the tiny remnant of his army into Kandahar, which was promptly besieged by Ayoub Khan.

Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Frederick Roberts were about to evacuate Kabul and return to India by different routes when the news of the terrible disaster at Maiwand reached them. Sir Frederick Roberts, soon to be known as Lord Roberts of Kandahar, with characteristic energy and daring undertook to march to the relief of Kandahar. The offer was accepted, and Roberts set out with an army of 10,000 men, composed of, roughly, 3000 British troops and 7000 Indian. If Maiwand was one of the greatest disasters ever experienced by British arms,

Roberts's march to Kandahar added a fresh lustre to our military glory and amply atoned for the misfortune. The intrepid "Bobs", as he was affectionately styled by his men, left the camp at Kabul on 9 August, and was unheard of for three weeks, until he suddenly appeared before Kandahar, utterly routed Ayoub Khan, and captured the whole of his artillery. Fortunately Sir Lepel Griffin had come to terms with Abdur Rahman, and the new ameer was able to facilitate General Roberts's approach. But the difficulties of the march were enormous, especially those of the transport, as owing to the urgency of the relief everything was done to hurry the advance. No wheeled vehicles went with the force, an enormous number of native bearers, horses, and mules being employed. The route of the army lay through varied climates. By day the troops were subjected to terrible heat, and at night to biting cold. There was no rest, the average marching being 15 miles a day. To have covered 320 miles in three weeks under the adverse conditions, and without the loss of a man, speaks volumes for the organization of Lord Roberts and his staff.

This feat of arms practically ended the campaign. Abdur Rahman was secure on his throne at Kabul, and there was only left the question of Kandahar. The new viceroy, Lord Ripon, experienced difficulties here. His council was still wedded to the theories of his predecessor, but eventually the policy of reversal won the day.

Orders were received by the British force to evacuate Afghanistan by degrees, until ultimately the whole army was withdrawn. Eventually Abdur Rahman overcame all opposition in Afghanistan, and Ayoub Khan was driven out of the country, to become eventually a pensioner of the Indian Government. Henceforth, now that the foreigner was out of his land, Abdur Rahman remained a staunch ally of Great Britain. Lord Lytton's choice had been wise, and counteracted the outward failure of his policy. Inwardly that policy had not been without fruit; its vigour had exposed Russian designs, and the Russian protégé had become the British ameer.

Before closing this section on Afghanistan we must advance our history to the memorable year 1885, and narrate what is known as the Penjdeh incident, which nearly brought about a war between Great Britain and Russia. Ever since the Congress of Berlin, Russia, foiled of the fruits of victory in the Balkans, had pursued a steady advance southwards through Central Asia. Early in 1884 Russia occupied Merv and Sarakhs, the gates to the Afghan frontier; she was now within 200 miles of Herat and consequently nearer the north-west frontier. The British foreign minister, Lord Granville, at once asked the Russian minister, M. de Giers, for an explanation. M. de Giers was very correct and conciliatory in his reply. Russia repudiated any designs on Afghanistan, which she regarded as a purely British sphere, and suggested a commission to settle the boundary in northern Afghanistan. That Russian designs were well known, at any rate in Berlin, has been established. There had been a meeting of the three emperors at

Skierniweice (September, 1884), and Bismarck, who ever was looking for inexpensive opportunities of conciliating Russia, and, with a view to the activities of the German Colonial Society, of embroiling Great Britain, had endorsed the Russian policy in Central Asia.

Great Britain was willing to appoint a commission, but first of all it was necessary to allay the suspicions of Abdur Rahman, that most independent of rulers. However, the wise policy of the Indian Government and the personal regard the ameer had for Lord Ripon had converted the ameer into a staunch ally; further, he scented aggression in the Russian move and knew his independence to be safe in British hands. Abdur Rahman consented to a commission; Great Britain appointed General Sir Peter Lumsden, and Russia nominated General Zelendi. The British commissioner arrived at Sarakhs, and expected to meet the Russian commissioner according to appointment in October. But De Giers delayed the dispatch of his agent—Petrograd and Berlin were watching the British expedition to Khartoum—and pretended to require a preliminary agreement. The moment seemed propitious, the news from Egypt was exceedingly grave, and Great Britain was fully occupied. Suddenly, on 8 February, 1885, Russia declared her intention of appropriating the Penjdeh district on the River Kuslik. Lord Granville protested and was willing to make large concessions to the emperor. Meanwhile Lord Kimberley, the Secretary for India, had supported the Afghan claim, and Penjdeh was occupied by a strong native force. M. de Giers would only concede that the Russians should not advance farther unless the Afghans attacked. But on 26 March the advance-guard of General Komaroff's army crossed the boundary agreed upon. Still the conduct of the Afghans was correct in refusing battle. Komaroff issued an ultimatum, and finally attacked the Afghans and occupied Penjdeh. The news of this violation of international law filled Great Britain with the utmost indignation, and war with Russia seemed difficult to avoid. Mr. Gladstone moved for a vote of £11,000,000, of which £6,500,000 was required for war preparations, and the conceding of this grant was an immense personal triumph for the veteran statesman.

But the Government was weak in carrying out the negotiations with Russia: it succumbed to the bluster of Petrograd, which refused to censure the conduct of General Komaroff. This concession was granted, and the ability of the British ambassador, Sir Robert Morier, enabled a compromise to be effected. The Afghans surrendered Penjdeh in exchange for the Zulfikar Pass and its approaches. This arrangement was also agreeable to Abdur Rahman, who had been exchanging views with Lord Dufferin at Rawal Pindi. But even then the danger of hostilities was not averted, for the Russians proceeded to obtain possession of the heights that commanded the Zulfikar Pass.

The Gladstone ministry resigned in June, 1885, and on the accession of Lord Salisbury to power, the Russian Government being occupied with the Bulgarian question, an arrangement was come to concerning the Zulfikar Pass, and a boundary was definitely fixed on 22 July, 1887.

Thus closed an exceedingly awkward episode, which outwardly seemed to lower British prestige in the Far East; but, inasmuch as the friendship of Abdur Rahman was maintained, the pacific measures of the "masterly inactivity" school had preserved its buffer state against Russian aggression, and now gave way to a necessary "forward policy" of protective measures on the north-west frontier.

CHAPTER VI

SOUTH AFRICA

The history of British colonization in South Africa is a history of blunders and blunders retrieved, of wastage and splendid heroism, of narrow political expediency and high political magnanimity. South Africa has proved the thorniest road that British imperialism has had to traverse.

Originally the settlement of South Africa was Dutch, and the Cape Colony was established as a half-way post between Holland and the Dutch East Indies. The settlers were purely farmers, and possessed little adaptability for town life and the arts of civilization, preferring their pastoral, semi-patriarchal existence to one of commercial expansion. With the acquirement of the Dutch colonies by Great Britain in Napoleonic times there arose in the Boer a fierce dislike, that almost amounted to hatred, of the British. To avoid British rule the Boers trekked farther and farther north, and there sprang into being the independent Dutch states—the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. But, in spite of this trekking, the Dutch outnumbered the British in the other South African colonies with the exception of Natal. The first South African boom arose in 1870 by the discovery of gold in the Transvaal and diamonds along the Vaal and Orange Rivers and at Kimberley in Cape Colony. Henceforth there was a flood of immigration from Europe that strengthened the non-Dutch population. The British and European settlers were vigorous and alert, and the Boers, who maintained their pastoral character, were no match for their competition. The sowing of that animosity of the Boer for the "outlander", which was to bear such bitter fruit, begins about this time.

While the interests between the two white races were perpetually conflicting there was in addition the serious problem, which even to-day presents difficulties, of the native population. The conflicts with the natives were often carried on with great excesses on the part of the white men, and this was particularly exemplified in 1874 by the treatment meted out to Langalibalele, a chief, who had been accused of intriguing with the Zulus under their powerful ruler Cetewayo. The British in Natal had been on friendly terms with the Zulus, but the arrogant behaviour of the Dutch had incurred the enmity of their cruel and crafty chief.

The then Secretary for the Colonies was Lord Carnarvon, a man of great sanity and clearness of vision, who was an imperialist of the modern school which recognizes the responsibility of the mother country for the welfare of her colonies. He disliked the noisy jingoism of the forward school. Lord Carnarvon wished to see a confederation of the South African states on much the same lines as had recently been established in Canada. Accordingly he sent out Sir Bartle Frere to South Africa as High Commissioner. Sir Bartle Frere was a man after Lord Carnarvon's own heart; to fearlessness and uprightness of character he added promptness and decision. In the most trying crisis the new High Commissioner always kept his head. Lord Carnarvon dismissed him to his duties with the hope that he would be the first Governor-General of the South African dominion.

But before Sir Bartle Frere could arrive at Cape Town the annexation of the Transvaal had resuscitated Boer animosity against the British, and the hope of South African federation was indefinitely postponed. This enormous blunder was due to Sir Theophilus Shepstone. The Government, recognizing the danger to South Africa from the Boer attitude towards the natives and their incapacity to cope with them, desired to see them under a strong central authority. Sir Theophilus was sent to Pretoria, with full powers, to persuade the Boers to enter the confederation. He found the Transvaal divided in opinion and utterly impoverished in exchequer. There was a considerable opinion in favour of federation but an overwhelming section opposed to it; but Shepstone professed to see in this opposition merely that of a tyrannous minority, and, in consideration of the needs of the situation and the lamentable condition of the country, declared the Transvaal annexed to the British Crown. When Sir Bartle Frere arrived in South Africa he found he must shoulder the additional burthen of Dutch discontent and the troubles caused by Boer misrule.

One of the Boer disputes with natives still remained unsettled. In 1875 the Boers had sought a rectification of their Zululand frontier with Cetewayo, very much in their own favour, and on the annexation of the Transvaal the Zulus looked to British justice. A commission was appointed under Sir Henry Bulwer, which gave a unanimous verdict against the Dutch.

One of the first actions required of the new High Commissioner on his arrival was the ratification of this award, which it was hoped would placate the Zulus. But the actions of Cetewayo had caused grave apprehension at the Cape. He was an extraordinarily able chieftain, unscrupulous and bloodthirsty, and he had raised the Zulu army into a most formidable weapon which was threatening South African civilization. Moreover, he made very little distinction between Dutch and British. To strengthen his military caste Cetewayo had introduced a savage custom into the Zulu army, that of making homicide necessary before marriage, and several Zulu girls had been murdered for disobeying this enactment. To Sir Henry Bulwer's remonstrances Cetewayo had replied in the haughtiest fashion. Sir Bartle Frere con-

sidered he was face to face with a general native revolt. Consequently, when the Bulwer award came to him for signature, he determined to use it as a lever to break the power of Cetewayo, and dispatched a commission to the chief to explain the award and to extract certain compensations for British protection, emphasizing the needs of the occasion by recent atrocities across the Natal border and the murder of two native women, for which Cetewayo insolently offered compensation of £50. Generally speaking, the compensation demanded was the disarmament of the Zulu army, the acceptance of a British resident, encouragement to missionaries, and the payment of a fine, together with the institution of marriage without "spear-washing". This ultimatum was strongly supported by Shepstone and Bulwer, and Cetewayo was given thirty days in which to reply. The indomitable Cetewayo vouchsafed no reply, and a state of war prevailed. Sir Bartle Frere had anticipated trouble, and his appeals for reinforcements, which at first had passed unheeded, were at last grudgingly allowed by the Colonial Secretary, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who appears to have been singularly unappreciative of South African needs. The High Commissioner was, in fact, isolated in the colony, owing to the lack of adequate support from Natal, while the majority of the Boers were indignant at the Bulwer award.

The period of the ultimatum having expired, Lord Chelmsford, who had been given the command of the expedition, invaded Zulu territory at the head of a considerable force, assisted by 3000 natives under the command of Colonel Pulleine and Colonel Durnford. Previous to starting, Lord Chelmsford had been warned about Zulu tactics by experienced Boers, and especially by Kruger and Joubert; but the British commander was not ready at accepting advice. Consequently, contrary to Boer custom, he encamped at Isandhlwana without proper precautions, such as the necessary ranging of the wagons in laager. On 22 June, 1879, Lord Chelmsford moved out of camp with a reconnoitring force and left the balance of his troops under the command of Colonel Pulleine. Suddenly Cetewayo, with 20,000 Zulus, swooped down on the camp and destroyed the British force of 800, including Colonel Durnford and Colonel Pulleine, and but for the heroic bravery of Chard and Bromhead the victorious horde would have burst into Natal. A state of panic prevailed, and Lord Chelmsford rushed back to the frontier. Eventually it became known that Colonel Wood was defending his own in the west, while Colonel Pearson took and held Ekowe although his communications were cut off. Consequently Lord Chelmsford refused to move until he was properly reinforced.

The news of Isandhlwana caused a great sensation at home; Sir Bartle Frere was censured, and merely from motives of expediency tolerated in his post. This treatment of Sir Bartle was scarcely fair, for his views on South African policy were well known.¹ "He did not believe that federation, which he was sent out to promote, would

¹ Paul's *Modern England*, Vol. IV.



SIR BARILE FRÈRE



PRESIDENT KRUGER

From photographs by Elliott & Fry, Ltd.



CECIL JOHN RHODES



JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN

be possible until the white inhabitants, British and Dutch, had been saved from native raids." In the meanwhile he continued to do his duty manfully, and, after making adequate provision for the safety of Natal, proceeded to a conference with leading Boers at Pretoria. This convention protested vigorously against the annexation, but was met with a flat statement that the steps were irretaceable. Pretorius, the spokesman for the Boers, threatened war; he would be satisfied with nothing but the restoration of their absolute independence. Frere refused, and the meeting came to an end.

Meanwhile the British operations against the Zulus improved. An attack on Colonel Wood's camp at Camballa was repulsed, and the garrison at Ekowe was relieved. Reinforcements arrived from England in April, and with an army of 24,000 men Lord Chelmsford made a fresh invasion of Zulu territory. Eventually the Zulus were utterly routed, and Ulundi, their capital, was burnt.

Yielding to popular clamour, Lord Chelmsford, who had retrieved his mistakes made at the outset by the ability and vigour with which he concluded the campaign, was superseded by Sir Garnet Wolseley, who was given full powers in Natal. Sir Bartle Frere was also sacrificed and summoned home. Sir Garnet Wolseley arrived too late for serious operations; he was successful in capturing Cetewayo, and there was nothing left for him to do but settle the Zulu territory. This he did rather hurriedly, without consulting Sir Bartle Frere. He divided Zululand into thirteen districts under separate chiefs and disarmed the warriors, leaving a British resident to settle disputes. This settlement met with scant approval in the colony: it was felt that Zululand should have been annexed and thrown open to emigration and the pioneers of civilization.

Thus ended the Zulu war; but there remained the aftermath of Boer discontent. Sir Bartle Frere had crushed the Zulus, but he was without the sympathetic support of Lord Carnarvon, who had retired from the colonial office, and the federal policy looked like failing. The Dutch in Cape Colony were loyal, but the misgovernment of Sir Owen Lanyon, who had been recently appointed in the Transvaal, was rapidly undermining their allegiance and precipitating a crisis. Meanwhile the imperialism of Disraeli had received a check, and Mr. Gladstone at the general election had returned to power with a large majority. As has been said, after the Zulu disaster Sir Bartle Frere was tolerated in office; but even this tolerance was distasteful to Mr. Gladstone's followers, who clamoured for his recall. The queen, however, was on Sir Bartle's side, and urged Gladstone to curb his followers until the High Commissioner could make some progress with his work of confederation. In spite of a strong radical memorandum of protest the prime minister decided to wait for a decision from the Cape Parliament. The Cape premier, Mr. Gordon Sprigg, had proposed a conference of delegates from Cape Colony, Natal, Griqualand West, and the Transvaal. But such a conference did not commend itself to the politicians, as they perceived

that the annexation of the Transvaal had shattered the chances of confederation. Mr. Sprigg did not press his resolution and Sir Bartle Frere was recalled, a victim to the vacillation of both cabinets, for neither Sir M. Hicks-Beach nor Mr. Gladstone had any clear vision with regard to South African affairs. Mr. Gladstone during his famous Midlothian campaign had thundered against annexation, so that a deputation led by such famous Boer leaders as Kruger and Joubert, which had waited on him in London, had to return to the Transvaal with the news of the premier's *volte-face*, by which he informed the deputation that "The Queen cannot be advised to relinquish her sovereignty over the Transvaal".

As a matter of fact there was a division in the cabinet; but Lord Kimberley, the Colonial Secretary, was for the policy of continuing the efforts for federation. But the refusal to give up the annexation of the Transvaal had practically killed all chances of federation, and the death-blow was dealt to the movement by the unconciliatory behaviour of Shepstone and Wolseley, and, above all, by the ineptitude of Lanyon, who informed the new governor of Natal, Sir George Colley, "that organized resistance to British power was impossible". And this in spite of the warnings issued by Mr. Brand, the president of the Orange Free State.

On Sir George Colley taking up his duties in 1881 as Deputy High Commissioner, in place of Sir Garnet Wolseley, he found the Boers exasperated and desertions of the Dutch from British garrisons frequent, while the complacent satisfaction of Lanyon was sublime. Suddenly, in 1880, the rebellion broke out, and the South African Republic was declared at Heidelberg. Mr. Brand, of the Orange Free State, made attempts at mediation, but Lord Kimberley, the Colonial Secretary, would only consent to listen after the Boers had laid down their arms.

However, no definite understanding could be arrived at. Sir George Colley, with a very inadequate force, invaded the Transvaal and came upon the Boers at Laings Nek, the pass between Natal and the Transvaal. Colley, without waiting for the reinforcements which were hurrying along under the command of Sir Evelyn Wood, made a turning movement towards Newcastle and fought an indecisive action on the Ingogo River. Between the engagements at Laings Nek and that at the Ingogo River Paul Kruger, the Boer leader, proposed to Sir George Colley the advisability of sending out a royal commission to make enquiries on the spot into Boer grievances.

Colley telegraphed home, and the suggestion was considered in a divided cabinet, John Bright and Joseph Chamberlain threatening to resign unless terms were made. Accordingly Sir George Colley was directed to inform the Boers that a commission would be appointed provided the Boers suspended hostilities. The governor was to give reasonable time for an answer; the garrison meanwhile were not to be relieved nor Laings Nek occupied. Sir George Colley, accordingly, wrote to Kruger on 21 February and demanded

a reply within forty-eight hours, as a matter of fact five days before Kruger actually received the letter, Sir George being under the impression that he was close at hand. On the 26th, there being no reply forthcoming from Kruger, Sir George Colley resumed his operations against Laings Nek. Without waiting for reinforcements he decided to occupy Majuba Hill, which he considered impregnable, and from this vantage to drive the Boers out of Laings Nek. He performed the difficult operation under cover of night and occupied the flat tableland overlooking the pass. The Boers, nothing daunted, started to assail the height in small detachments, and, taking careful cover from the badly-directed British fire, reached the summit without any casualties. The British force was completely routed. Sir George Colley was shot in the engagement and about 90 officers and men were killed and 60 prisoners were taken. The Boer achievement was the more remarkable because its force only consisted of 200 men. The disasters of Majuba Hill and Maiwand, within a few years of each other, were heavy prices to pay for British imperialism. On the news reaching England there was a great popular outcry, and Lord Roberts was sent out to take supreme command with a force of 10,000 men, while Sir Evelyn Wood was already hurrying to the front with reinforcements amounting to 13,000 men. The tragedy of Majuba is heightened in the light of subsequent knowledge by the fact that Sir George Colley's letter reached Paul Kruger on the morrow of the reverse, and a reply of acceptance of its terms was handed to Sir Evelyn Wood. Nevertheless Sir Evelyn Wood was in favour of vindicating the British arms in force, preparatory to dispersing the Boers to their homes; but he was overruled by the home Government. An armistice of eight days was granted, and eventually peace was signed on 12 August, 1881, by which the Transvaal regained its independence under the "suzerainty" of the Crown. This word "suzerainty", which was to be a stumbling-block in years to come, was strongly objected to by the Boers, but Lord Kimberley insisted on its retention, and the peace had to be accepted in its entirety or left alone. The peace was the subject of fierce controversy at home: in popular opinion the Government had climbed down disgracefully. The cabinet was divided on the subject, but the strong attitude assumed by Bright and Chamberlain won the day. Moreover, the plea of the opposition of a vigorous show of force was scarcely a strong one. Either the Transvaal should have been retained or not retained: it was not statecraft to waste men and treasure in subjugating the Boers with the fixed intention all the time of restoring to them their freedom.

The restoration of their liberty to the Boers and the founding of the South African Republic marked for many years a period of reaction in Transvaal affairs which was to have disastrous consequences to the relationship between the South African colonies and the mother country. In 1883 Mr. Kruger was elected president of the South

African Republic, and by his qualities of what has been styled "slimness" contrived to keep himself in power for many years. He was a man of great personal courage and indomitable will, but possessed of an extraordinarily narrow intellect that was subordinated to the fanatic creed of the "Dopper" sect to which he belonged. Paul Kruger always had faith in his own divine mission, and his reason was clouded by the bigotry in which he surrounded himself. In political matters he was the grand reactionary. To him the Boers were the chosen people of God, and he preferred them to keep to the pastoral life of their ancestors. But the discovery of diamonds and gold in the Transvaal and the consequent enormous rush of miners and speculators made the success of such a policy impossible. Yet Kruger stuck to his creed of a "favoured people", and the more the outlander population increased, till it outnumbered the natives, the more he hid himself behind an enormous posse of Boer officials, refusing the franchise to the outlanders, who were grievously taxed without any representation, and the Dutch language alone was tolerated, even in trial by jury. President Kruger pretended to regard the "outlanders" as merely a temporary population, in spite of the fact that from a village of settlers' huts Johannesburg had become a populous city of stately buildings with all the evidences of wealthy stability; for he feared the swamping of the Boers. As the hated "outlanders", and especially the British, were contributing to three-quarters of the prosperity of the state, their grievances were real and crying for redress.

If "Oom Paul" stood for narrow reaction, Cecil John Rhodes stood for a vigorous forward policy and the aims and ideals of British imperialism. He dreamt a splendid dream of British dominance, and at his death left his vast wealth to British education—moral, intellectual, and physical. By his successful amalgamation of the De Beers mines he became enormously wealthy and was punningly spoken of as the Colossus. With all the ramifications of successful finance behind him he applied himself to what, in the realization of his dream, he considered his life-work—a united South Africa under British rule. As a young man he had perceived the potential wealth of Matabeleland, and, fearful that all this fine territory spreading to the north might fall into the hands of the Boers, or rather into the hands of Germany, so recently embarked on a policy of grab in Africa, he managed to obtain, in 1889, a charter for his British South African Company, which waged a successful war with the Matabele and added a territory of 750,000 square miles to the British Empire. In 1895 Mr. Rhodes became Premier of Cape Colony, in which position he enjoyed the confidence of British and Dutch alike, and was undoubtedly the most famous man in South Africa. But in 1896 he allowed his name to suffer an obscurity, from which it is only just emerging, by his connection with the hasty and ill-fated Jameson raid—the subject of one of the fiercest controversies of modern times.

The repeated deputations and representations of their grievances made to President Kruger having met with contemptuous refusal, the

"outlanders" determined to take matters into their own hands. In 1892 the Transvaal National Union was formed to demand equal rights for all citizens in the state. The president received the delegates with an insolent refusal to alter his policy. In 1894 Lord Loch, the High Commissioner, visited Kruger almost to implore him to make concessions. Finally, the corruption in the administration of the Netherlands Railway and the high tariffs imposed proved the last straw, and the committee of the "outlanders" were approached by Mr. Rhodes and Dr. Jameson, the commander of the Chartered Company's mounted police. It was arranged that the influential "outlanders" should continue their agitation for concessions from Kruger, while Dr. Jameson assembled a force on the frontier. If Kruger continued in his obstinacy, Dr. Jameson was to march to Pretoria while the "outlanders" made a successful rising in Johannesburg. Unfortunately the preparations in Johannesburg did not prosper as the committee expected, the greatest difficulty being experienced in the distribution of rifles. Dr. Jameson crossed the frontier prematurely and was soon overwhelmed by a superior force that had been waiting for him. Oom Paul had obtained early knowledge of the plot, and the invasion ended in a ridiculous fiasco. President Kruger immediately pounced upon the ring-leaders. The four chief instigators of the rebellion were tried and sentenced to death, a penalty which was afterwards changed to the enormous fine of £25,000 in each case; the lesser lights of the movement were punished by various degrees of imprisonment and fines, and in some cases by exile. The crowning "blunder" of the Jameson raid was received with mixed feelings at home; the sober-minded politicians were aghast at the folly of it, while the sporting element in the populace cheered the pluck and heroism of Dr. Jameson's ill-fated band. Such an outrageous violation of international law could not, of course, go unpunished by the home Government. Dr. Jameson and his principal officers were imprisoned, and officers still on the active list in some cases lost their commissions. The event had wounded British and European public conscience. A special South African committee, comprising every shade of political opinion, was appointed by Parliament. The proceedings of the committee have been the subject of much controversy and gave offence to the Dutch, who maintained that the Colonial Office, under Mr. Chamberlain, was perfectly aware of the Johannesburg conspiracy and took no steps to prevent it; further, they maintained that certain telegrams of vital importance to their case were not produced before the committee. Nevertheless the committee framed its report in correct attitude of blame for the undertaking, but acquitted Mr. Rhodes of complicity in Dr. Jameson's raid, though they considered his actions previous to the raid incompatible with his duties as prime minister of the Cape. Mr. Rhodes himself recognized the justice of the finding, both in London and Cape Town, and, immediately retiring from his office, threw all his energy into the administration of his newly founded colony, Rhodesia.

The Jameson raid and subsequent events left the reactionary Boers

more embittered than ever; moreover, it had the worse effect, thus doubly defeating its object, of restoring the waning popularity of President Kruger. In the presidential election that followed hard upon the event Kruger defeated the progressive Boers, and obtained another term of office by a handsome majority. The Transvaal at once, under his direction, began to arm to the teeth, and the bigger the military preparations the worse the domestic government seemed to become. Despairing of ever receiving acknowledgment from the corrupt system of Krugerism, the "outlanders" sent a monster petition for the righting of their grievances to Queen Victoria. Mr. Chamberlain at once proposed a conference, and Sir Alfred Milner, afterwards Lord Milner, who had recently been appointed high commissioner, met President Kruger at Bloemfontein in 1899. The conference was a failure, the concessions Kruger had to offer were nothing compared with what he wished to exact for himself. He desired to abolish the word "suzerainty", which had been such a stumbling-block to the framing of a treaty after the disaster of Majuba, and to establish the principle of arbitration to be applied in all future disputes between the two countries. Rightly or wrongly, Mr. Chamberlain had decided views as to the "suzerainty" of Great Britain, and the question of arbitration was not to be heard of for a moment. After the failure of the conference the diplomatic strain became greater. Sir Alfred Milner, whose policy was endorsed by Mr. Chamberlain, believed in a firm hand. President Kruger thought this show of power but a bluff, and believed that Great Britain would not dare, in the face of European opinion, to attack the liberties of the Transvaal. Further, as the evidence shows, the president hoped for European intervention, especially from Germany. After the Jameson raid the German emperor had dispatched to him a characteristic telegram of congratulation, which nearly brought about a European war, and the intrigues of Berlin had strengthened President Kruger in that hope. The truth probably is that each party thought the other would climb down. The original matter of outlander grievances had by this time faded into insignificance compared with the real issue—British or Boer supremacy.

To mark time and veil his military preparations Kruger kept up a diplomatic correspondence with the Colonial Office, which, always irritating, increased in arrogance. In October, 1899, the president was ready, from a military point of view, and handed an ultimatum to the British agent at Pretoria, which was in itself a declaration of war; for the British pride had suffered much, but this was just too much. As Professor Egerton so aptly puts it: "Throughout this period the mother country was on its trial, and to have yielded at the last to Boer pretensions would have given a shock to British sentiment throughout the empire which would probably have had calamitous results for its future."¹

The immediate result of the declaration of war was an outburst of violent Anglophobia on the Continent, which was most in evidence in Holland, where Dutch relationship with the Boers condoned it, and

¹ Egerton's *History of British Colonial Policy*.

in Germany, where the astute wire-pullers of the Wilhelmstrasse used it as fuel for the fanning of the flame of pan-Germanism. But apart from the necessity or otherwise of the war—a question which is far too recent and controversial to be discussed here—this outbreak of Anglo-phobia had its antidote in the splendid loyalty of the empire at large. When the dark days of the campaign came, and the statesmen of Europe began to whisper the tidings of the breaking-up of the British Empire, from every British dominion and colony volunteers flocked to the Union Jack. The empire generally was not concerned with the rights or wrongs of the causes of the war; it recognized at once the real fact—the mother country was fighting the battle of imperial interests. There was a challenging ring about Mr. Chamberlain's cry: "Learn to think imperially!"

We do not propose to dwell at length on the campaign, as the popular literature on the subject is enormous, and many of the heroes who took part in the war are happily still living, and the fame of their deeds imperishably green. When hostilities began the Boers at once took the offensive, the British being in greatly inferior numbers. After defeating the Boers at Elandslaagte and Talana Hill, General Sir George White, the commander in Natal, was forced to retire on Ladysmith. The enemy had been equally active in the west, and Kimberley and Mafeking were speedily invested. When Sir Redvers Buller, to whom the supreme command had been entrusted, reached South Africa, he found beleaguered garrisons in the east and the west, and deemed it necessary to divide his forces. He himself took the eastern command, and started for the relief of Ladysmith, while to Lord Methuen was entrusted the relief of Kimberley. As events turned out, both forces proved inadequate for their allotted tasks, and within one week—still spoken of as the "black week"—the British forces suffered heavy defeats in the east and west. Lord Methuen was routed at Magersfontein (10 December) and a subordinate command under General Gatacre met with a heavy reverse at Stormberg on the same day. Sir Redvers Buller, in attempting the passage of the Tugela River, was defeated with heavy loss at Colenso.

The tidings of this disaster rallied the empire to the call, and help was promised from every dominion and dependency. The gravity of the situation was at once grasped by the Government, and reinforcements of the regular army and volunteers were shipped to South Africa. Sir Redvers Buller was superseded, and the indomitable Lord Roberts took over the command, with Lord Kitchener as his chief of staff.

Lord Roberts at once acted in characteristic way on the brisk offensive. After relieving Kimberley he routed the forces of Cronje at Paardeberg (28 February, 1900), and the occupation of Bloemfontein became easy. The larger operations in the west had loosened the pressure on Ladysmith, and, after the ugly disaster at Spion Kop, Sir Redvers Buller at last succeeded in entering the beleaguered town. But it was May before a special expedition managed to relieve the heroic garrison at Mafeking.

To all intents and purposes the war was now at an end. The Orange Free State and the Transvaal had been formally annexed, and there only remained to subdue the guerrilla warfare that prevailed. The administrative genius of Lord Kitchener at last wore down the last resistance, and a truce was proclaimed at Vereeniging in May, 1902. A brighter day was to dawn for South Africa. From the blunders of the past, through the bitterness of war, there was born a sane imperialism which can no longer be gainsaid. By the coincidence of fate the two antagonists of South African policy—the reactionary and the dreamer of imperial destiny—died in the same year, 1903—Stephanus Paul Kruger (Oom Paul) and Cecil John Rhodes.

For several years the aim of the Conservative Government was to conciliate and resettle the country, after the ravages of war, by loans of money on generous terms and grants to agriculture.

In 1906 the Liberals returned to power with the biggest majority of modern times. One of the first actions of Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's cabinet, and with—we think it may be conceded—the general approval of the nation, self-government was restored, first to the Transvaal and then to the Orange River Colony.

Seldom in the history of the world has there been a greater example of political magnanimity. With such a spirit of goodwill prevailing the progress of South African union was assured. In 1909 the Union of South Africa was an accomplished fact, and, to cement the good racial understanding, General Botha, who had led the Boers so brilliantly throughout the war, became the first prime minister. In 1910 the Union Parliament of South Africa was opened with splendid ceremonial by the Duke and Duchess of Connaught.

CHAPTER VII

GREAT BRITAIN AND MODERN EGYPT

Prince Bismarck, to use a homely phrase, had a nose for scenting trouble. When at the Congress of Berlin he suggested to Lord Beaconsfield that Great Britain should annex Egypt he either saw clearly that this country sooner or later must participate in Egyptian affairs, therefore he might bow to the inevitable and get a cheap reputation as an *amicus Britannorum*, or he may have hoped to embroil the British with the French for the greater glory of Germany. Who can tell what thoughts were passing behind Lord Beaconsfield's sphinx-like mask when he refused the tempting offer and posed at all costs as the upholder of Ottoman integrity? Possibly he may have regarded the offer lightly, as the "vapourings of a German Baron", or yet again seriously, as being in the nature of a Greek gift! Whatever may have been the real reason, Great Britain came away from the congress with Cyprus—for which tribute must be paid—and the golden opportunity

was lost. "What might have been had without asking was unattainable without a European War in 1879."¹ Destiny forced Great Britain to go to Egypt and govern the fellaheen for their good, and Continental diplomacy has been asking ever since for a date for her evacuation of the country.

The direct cause of active British interference in the affairs of modern Egypt must be traced to finance, and dates from the accession of the khedive, Ismail Pasha, in 1863. Ismail Pasha, anxious to play a big rôle in European politics, was utterly regardless of the way in which he exploited the national resources for his own benefit. During the American Civil War there had been a boom in Egyptian cotton, and the country had enjoyed a spell of comparative prosperity. But when the days of peace came the price of cotton fell to normal conditions and the boom was over. The reaction was great, for Ismail had been spending money like water on various extravagant schemes, some of which were conceived in grandiose spirit but most of which were of no permanent value to the nation. An attempt to recuperate from the cotton crisis by an extensive cultivation of sugar ended in failure and the khedive's financial position became worse than ever, until in 1875, from a modest £3,000,000 at his accession, the national debt had reached to almost £90,000,000. The khedive himself had to do what he could to weather the storm, and in 1875 he parted with his Suez Canal shares, in the manner already told, to the British Government for £4,000,000.

In 1875 a special mission at the invitation of the khedive, with Mr. Cave at its head, was sent out to Cairo to examine the condition of Egyptian finance. When Mr. Cave's report was published the truly lamentable state of affairs became manifest; it disclosed a tale of reckless expenditure that had practically brought the land to the verge of bankruptcy. Mr. Cave recommended the appointment of a trusted European official to control the spending department. The British Government took small heed of Mr. Cave's report, but when, in the following year, Ismail Pasha suspended payment of the treasury bills something had to be done. Inasmuch as the chief bondholders were the French and the British, a mixed commission under M. Joubert and Mr. Goschen (afterwards Lord Goschen) was sent out to Egypt to examine the state of affairs on behalf of the bondholders. This was the beginning of the unsatisfactory and irregular dual control. The result of the commission was the establishment of the *Caisse de la Dette*, or Commission of the Public Debt, and commissioners were appointed by Italy, France, and Austria. Great Britain, jealous of foreign intervention in Egyptian domestic affairs, at first held aloof; but since the efforts of the commission (1877) for the bondholders had met with little success, in 1878 she sent out a new commission under Mr. Rivers Wilson, and on pressure being put the khedive consented to the principle of ministerial control. Nubar Pasha and Mr. Rivers Wilson became his first ministers, and then, at the vigorous insistence

¹ Paul's *Modern England*, Vol. IV.

of the French, M. de Blignières was added to their number. From this time it became impossible for Great Britain to retire from Egyptian affairs.

Ismail Pasha soon grew impatient of ministerial control and in 1879 dismissed Nubar Pasha, declaring his intention of himself presiding over all meetings of the cabinet. He made a show of appointing fresh ministers in his sons, Tewfik Pasha and Sherif Pasha. This resumption of power by Ismail was decidedly embarrassing; France and England watched each other. But Prince Bismarck, who had hitherto seemed to take little interest in Egypt, suddenly intervened on behalf of the German bondholders and petitioned the Porte forcibly for the removal of Ismail. Great Britain and France promptly joined their voices to that of Germany and the sultan yielded. Ismail Pasha was recalled, and his son, Tewfik, reigned in his stead. By the consent of Europe the dual control of Egyptian affairs by France and Great Britain was recognized. Tewfik succeeded to a troubled state. The revenue was crippled by the necessity of appropriating half of it for the payment of interest to the bondholders, and the undisciplined state of his army was to have alarming results.

In 1881 a revolt broke out in the army, headed by Arabi Bey and a so-called nationalist party, with the cry: "Egypt for the Egyptians"; but the movement was entirely one originating with the native officers desirous of obtaining that higher promotion which was exclusive to the Turkish personnel, and Arabi was a picturesque enough personality for their purpose.

Tewfik, young, incompetent, and without the benefit of a Western education, would have yielded to Arabi at once if British pressure had not been too strong for him; but he went so far as to dismiss Riaz Pasha, the prime minister, and to make Arabi a pasha and Minister of War. By now the movement was quite out of hand, and France and Great Britain determined to act: a joint note was accordingly dispatched to the khedive offering Western support in the restoration of order. On the situation becoming still more serious the British and French fleets appeared before Alexandria, the instantaneous effect of which was to bring about a show of submission to the khedive. But the irrepressible Arabi had meanwhile ordered the construction of batteries, and the British consul reported that the town was in danger and the mutiny spreading. A serious massacre of Europeans within the walls compelled the admirals to take stern measures, and the forts of Alexandria were bombarded after the British admiral, Sir Beauchamp Seymour, had given due warning. The news of the bombardment caused a great outcry among certain sections in this country and abroad. There was a stormy scene in Parliament, and the question was asked: why the British fleet was at the disposal of the sultan? Mr. Bright felt so strongly on the subject that he resigned; Prince Bismarck was virtuously indignant. Gladstone and Lord Granville were anxious to avoid being entangled in Egyptian affairs, but they maintained that it was their duty to protect their countrymen and the Suez Canal.

A meeting of ambassadors was held at Constantinople with no solid result. The sultan refused to interfere in the quelling of the rebellion from religious scruples, the riots being chiefly anti-Christian in character. Great Britain asked France to co-operate in an expedition against Arabi; but the fiery Gambetta was gone and his successor, De Freycinet, could obtain no support, consequently Great Britain was left to act alone.

Sir Garnet Wolseley landed at Ismaili on 15 August, 1882, with a force of 30,000 men and defeated Arabi Pasha at Tel-el-Kebir on 3 September. Arabi himself was captured, and 3000 men surrendered. British troops proceeded to garrison Cairo and the khedive returned from Alexandria, whither he had fled. The result of the expedition was the firm establishment of British rule in Egypt. This was a state of affairs anything but pleasant to a liberal administration, which desired as little foreign adventure in its policy as possible. Lord Dufferin was sent to Cairo from Constantinople to relieve Sir Edward Mallet, as a temporary expedient, to report generally on the British occupation and find a way out. One of the first actions of Lord Dufferin was to put an end to the farce of the trial of Arabi Pasha and four other ring-leaders. At his advice they pleaded guilty, were sentenced to death, and the sentence was as promptly commuted to banishment. This leniency was severely criticized; it was thought a Machiavellian policy to occupy Egypt with the intention of upholding the authority of the khedive and pardon armed officers who had rebelled against him. Now "foreign bayonets must protect the authority of the khedive".¹ In any case Great Britain was in a fix. Whereas but a few years previously she might have had Egypt with the consent of Europe she was now pledged at great cost to maintain order in a land which she must, under the jealous eyes of her rivals, evacuate, or at any rate practise a correct diplomacy with that object in view. Accordingly, Lord Granville sent a dispatch to the Powers interested, in which he stated the uselessness of his appeal to the sultan to preserve order. The British Foreign Minister promised the reduction of the army of occupation to 12,000 men and proposed the neutrality of the Suez Canal and establishment of representative institutions.

Meanwhile Lord Dufferin's tireless activity had brought about the rejection of the dual control and the abolition of the kurbash. Sir Auckland Colvin was summoned to Egypt as first financial adviser, and a scheme of reorganization of the Egyptian army was set on foot. Lord Dufferin then dispatched a masterly report to the Foreign Office full of the notions of liberal measures—such as village constituencies, provincial councils, and legislative council likely to suit Mr. Gladstone's Government, and, though never mentioning occupation, he dared to hint at the desirability of "the masterful hand of a resident". He then returned to more congenial duties at Constantinople. Mr. Gladstone sent out Sir Evelyn Baring in 1883, afterwards Lord Cromer, as agent and consul-general in accordance with the suggestions em-

¹ Sir Auckland Colvin's *The Making of Modern Egypt*.

bodied in Lord Dufferin's dispatch, and the destiny of Egypt for over twenty years was to be controlled by this remarkable man. Sir Evelyn Baring's task at the outset would have been wellnigh impossible but for the pressure of the British army: he could always threaten with it as a last resort.

That France should be annoyed at the turn of events was only natural. She had to witness the handing over of the control of the Suez Canal, which had been largely built by French money, to the power that had opposed its construction. But France had made the fatal mistake of refusing to help in the work of restoring order and quelling the Arabi rebellion. Great Britain may have been, in the opinion of some critics, precipitate in mixing in Egyptian affairs—an interference which was part and parcel of Lord Beaconsfield's upholding of Ottoman integrity—but, once having entered the fray, she could not withdraw and leave the country to anarchy. Undoubtedly the occupation prevented the earlier realizing of that excellent understanding which now exists between the two nations.

Hitherto the British occupation of Egypt, if it had occasioned some diplomatic growling, had been fairly defined and correct; but anxious days were ahead, and the Egyptian question was to prove itself a veritable volcano for the safety of British policy. The troubled state of the Sudan was to be the cause. At the time Sir Evelyn Baring arrived in Cairo the Sudan was in open rebellion under the fanatic banner of the new prophet of Islam, the Mahdi. An expedition under Hicks Pasha, which had been dispatched to quell the rebellion, had been utterly routed by the followers of the Mahdi at El Obeid, 5 November, 1883. Mr. Gladstone's Government professed to regard the expedition of Hicks Pasha as unauthorized—even Lord Dufferin had described Hicks as acting "on his own responsibility"—and proposed the plea that the Sudan was out of their jurisdiction. But the quibble was unworthy; Great Britain had undertaken the restoration of good government in Egypt, and she had to be responsible for even the side-issues of that undertaking. Sir Evelyn Baring was also of the opinion that it was impossible to separate the Sudanese question from the Egyptian. General Valentine Baker, meanwhile, had set out to relieve the garrisons in the Eastern Sudan from Osman Digna, the Mahdi's emir. His force, consisting chiefly of Egyptians, proved poor fighting-stuff, and was utterly defeated by Osman's levies. A successful expedition of 4000 British forces under Sir Gerald Graham, which routed the enemy at El Teb and at Tamai, found its work thrown away by the refusal of the British Government to advance beyond Suakin.

But at last the national conscience was awakened, and the character of the Sudan revolt was beginning to be understood. The power of that strange fanatic sect, the Dervishes, was alarmingly on the increase, and the influence of the Mahdi was becoming steadily established. The name of Gordon, with his experience of the Sudan, sprang to men's lips, and there arose a newspaper agitation that he should be sent out to relieve the loyal garrisons shut in by the Dervishes. In 1884 the




SIR GARNET (LORD) WOLSELEY



GENERAL GORDON

From photographs by London Stereoscopic Co.



SIR EVELYN BARING (LORD CROMER)



SIR H. H. (LORD) KITCHENER

suggestion of sending General Gordon had been twice put before Sir Evelyn Baring, and had been twice refused. Sir Evelyn did not believe he was a suitable man for the post; he wished for a man who would obey instructions implicitly, and only when Abd-el-Kader refused the undertaking did he reluctantly give his consent, yielding to the pressure of Mr. Gladstone. In an interview with the Government General Gordon was informed that his instructions were to relieve the garrisons in the Sudan and evacuate the country, leaving what provision he could for its future government. In these instructions the general acquiesced, and they were again impressed upon him by Sir Evelyn Baring when he arrived at Cairo.

Probably round no hero of the past has such fierce controversy raged as that round General Gordon and his personal responsibility for the events that happened. Without in the least entering into the controversy, it may be conceded, we think, that the general was the wrong man for the undertaking. He was too individualistic, too much of the mystic, always to interpret obedience to orders in an official sense.

Immediately on his arrival at Cairo General Gordon, at his own request, was proclaimed Governor-General of the Sudan, and that sagacious companion in all his misfortunes, Colonel Stewart, was appointed his chief of staff. While in Cairo he ran across Zobeir Pasha, whom in his former administration in the Sudan he had condemned for complicity in a military plot; but on this occasion Gordon experienced a mystic feeling that he could trust his former enemy, and that Zobeir would be the very man to help him in Khartoum. He thought that Zobeir might, after the evacuation, form a buffer state between Egypt and the Mahdi. Gordon even won over Sir Evelyn Baring and Nubar Pasha to his views, but Lord Granville gave an absolute refusal: it was beneath the dignity of Great Britain to appoint an ex-slave-dealer with such a reputation as Zobeir Pasha.

Gordon arrived at Khartoum on 18 February, received an enthusiastic welcome, and set about reforms. True to the policy of evacuation, he promised the retention of slavery, since he perceived that on the retirement of the garrisons it would be impossible to abolish it. He now electrified Mr. Gladstone by the statement that he considered the Madhi should be smashed up. This was a forward policy, and therefore highly distasteful to the Government, who were on the point of recalling Gordon. The state of Europe was unsettled, and, owing to the irregular position of Great Britain in Egypt, anything that could be construed into an act of aggression might be fraught with dangerous results. Sir Evelyn Baring now recognized that unless Zobeir Pasha were dispatched it would be a question of sending an expedition to get Gordon out of Khartoum. But his advice to the Government fell on deaf ears; they affected to believe that the general was quite safe, and could march out of Khartoum when he liked. Khartoum was now shut off from the outer world, and the murder of Colonel Stewart while bearing dispatches added to Gordon's loneli-

ness. At last the representations from Cairo became urgent; a relief expedition would be necessary; but still the Government vacillated for several months. It was felt that the general had exceeded his orders, but he could not be left to his fate. The opposition, especially the brilliant "fourth party", under the leadership of Lord Randolph Churchill, was loud in the denunciation of the dilatory tactics of the Government, and probably Mr. Gladstone was never so much heckled in his life. At last, in August, 1884, Lord Wolseley, who had been entrusted with the command of the relief expedition, left London for Egypt, and on arriving at Cairo found 10,000 British troops at his disposal. But vexatious delays occurred, and it was October before he could start for Wady Halfa. Meanwhile Gordon, all alone, was resolutely waiting at Khartoum. The expedition of the Nile became a race against time. Gordon was very hard pressed; his garrison of 34,000 was reduced to famine food, and the Dervishes were tightening their grip. The expedition was unexpectedly delayed at Debbeh and Dongola. On arriving on Christmas Day at Korti, Lord Wolseley divided his force into two divisions, and sent one division, under Sir Herbert Stewart, across the desert to the Nile at Metemmeh. Stewart was attacked at Abu Klea by a superior force of Dervishes, and lost his life in the encounter, the command falling to Sir Charles Wilson. On reaching the river, 17 January, 1885, Sir Charles Wilson's force found four steamers which Gordon had sent in anticipation, and under a galling fire from the banks Sir Charles steamed towards Khartoum, only to arrive too late.

The failure of the expedition to arrive in time caused the most unprecedented indignation at home, and the popular wrath was really unbounded. With the greatest difficulty, and by the help of the vigilance of the whips, the Government escaped defeat on a vote of censure. To cover their confusion the cabinet made a vigorous show of an offensive campaign against the Mahdi; a million pounds was to be expended on a railway from Suakin to Berber, and the Dervish rule was to be exterminated. But the trouble with Russia over the Afghanistan boundary diverted popular attention, and the Sudan was evacuated for thirteen years, the death of the Mahdi affording a sufficient excuse. By the use of this political expedient the southern boundary of Egypt was fixed at Wady Halfa.

The history of the next few years is the history of Egyptian domestic policy, and the course of consolidation under the brilliant guidance of Sir Evelyn Baring and a handful of devoted officials. The aim of British diplomacy had always been to get some regular acknowledgment of our occupation of the country, and also to find a means of fulfilling our pledges of evacuation. In 1887 Lord Salisbury was desirous of regularizing British rule in Egypt by obtaining the sanction of the sultan, and Sir Henry Drummond Wolff was sent on a special expedition to Constantinople. Sir Drummond Wolff was successful in his attempts, and it was agreed that the year 1890, provided the safety of Egypt permitted it, should be fixed as the limit of occupa-

tion. Most of the Great Powers consented to those terms, but the treaty fell through owing to the opposition of France and Russia. Great Britain was thereby destined to continue her rule. The jealousy of the French became, perhaps, more academic than real; but in 1892 M. Waddington, the French ambassador, seized the opportunity of the return to power of a Liberal administration to reopen the question, and asked the Government to fix a date for the termination of the occupation. But Lord Rosebery took the sound view that the French had forfeited their right to interfere by their action in 1887, and he declined to discuss the subject. In 1893 Tewfik Pasha died, and he was succeeded by his young son, Abbas. Such a sudden elevation to power proved too much for the common sense of the boy Khedive. He evinced a desire to rule absolutely, and dismissed summarily three pronouncedly Anglophile ministers, the vacancies being filled with nominees of his own. Sir Evelyn Baring, the most autocratic of British pro-consuls, refused to recognize the nominees, and Lord Rosebery supported him with a veiled show of military force and the statement that "So long as England occupied Egypt her advice must be followed by the Egyptian Government". Sir Evelyn Baring's wise administration began very soon after the unfortunate evacuation of the Sudan to bear good fruit. Finance was put on a proper footing, a loan was granted by the Powers in 1885 for nine millions, and in 1888 the first budget was produced without a deficit. The revenue continued to be devoted to public works of first utility, which culminated in the opening of the colossal dam at Assouan in 1901. Education and justice were reformed. When Lord Cromer retired in 1907 he had good occasion to be proud of his handiwork.

There now but remains to narrate in a few words the story of the wonderful campaign for the recovery of the Sudan. The quiet years that followed the "too late" expedition of Lord Wolseley were devoted to the reorganization of the Egyptian army. The mixed Egyptian and Sudanese troops, by good pay, efficient training, and excellent feeding, had developed into a splendid fighting force, thanks to the genius of their sirdars, Sir Evelyn Wood and Sir Herbert Kitchener, now Earl Kitchener.

After the death of the Mahdi the cause of Mahdism was championed by the Khalifa, and under his sway the movement lost its religious character and became a mere military occupation of the Sudan with designs on Egyptian conquest. In 1896 it was decided to send out an expedition to reconquer the Sudan, and Sir Herbert Kitchener was appointed commander-in-chief, with a splendid staff hardened in service against the Dervishes. The campaign opened by the capture of Dongola, which formed a military base and the magazine for the perfect material which the organizing genius of Sir Herbert Kitchener had prepared. The desert railway—a marvel of engineering cheapness—was built from Wady Halfa to Berber, and that place and Abu Hamed fell into the expedition's hands (August, 1897).

Early in 1898 the Egyptian army was strengthened by four British

battalions, and an advance was made to the Atbara River, where the Dervishes were encamped 18,000 strong. The enemy was defeated with huge slaughter, 2500 being killed and over 2000 made prisoners. This opened the advance on Omdurman, which was captured on 2 September; the Khalifa fled into the desert, and was eventually captured by Sir Reginald Wingate after wandering for a year. The brilliant campaign closed with an affecting memorial service to General Gordon in Khartoum, near the spot where he had laid down his life, and the British and Egyptian flags were hoisted over the citadel.

Scarcely had the rejoicings of the army over their victorious entry into Khartoum culminated before grave news reached Sir Herbert Kitchener, through native messengers, that white men had made their appearance at Fashoda, some 300 miles south of Khartoum. Major Marchand's French expedition had arrived from the Congo, and the French flag was flying as a sign that the district had been annexed. The situation was critical in view of the traditional French jealousy of British occupation of Egypt. Sir Herbert Kitchener left Omdurman in a special steamer for Fashoda. The meeting between the two men—both remarkable soldiers—provided a dramatic situation. Courtesies were exchanged, and the Egyptian flag was hoisted alongside the French. Sir Herbert Kitchener after consenting to allow the matter to be referred to the French Government in Paris, himself wrote a forcible protest against the French occupation to his own Government, and returned to Khartoum.

Lord Salisbury rose to the occasion; the victory of Omdurman had strengthened his hand, and he claimed that all the Mahdi's territories had returned to khedival rule owing to the victory. France gave way, and Major Marchand was ordered to vacate Fashoda, the name of which, to prevent any unpleasantness remaining, was changed by the British Government. The Fashoda incident was the last dart of French academic jealousy. Gradually better relations prevailed between the two countries—the excellence of the British finance had undoubtedly made its appeal to French thrift—and in 1904 an Anglo-French agreement was signed by which it was recognized that the whole valley of the Nile lay within the sphere of British influence, and the last cause of mistrust between the two great Western Powers was removed.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PARTITION OF AFRICA

We have already dealt with British policy in South Africa and Egypt, and it now remains to give a sketch of the relationship of Great Britain with the other Powers of Europe in regard to the sudden scramble which began to take place about 1880 for the possession of colonies in the dark continent. This fierce struggle for territory in the

THE FLIGHT OF THE KHALIFA. From a painting by R. Talbot Kelly, R.I., in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

On 2nd September, 1898, an Anglo-Egyptian army of some 23,000, under the Sirdar, Sir Herbert (now Earl) Kitchener, completely defeated a Dervish army of some 50,000 at Omdurman in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The Dervish army was under the Khalifa, who had succeeded the Mahdi, the leader of the revolt in the 'eighties. The Khalifa, leaving his wives on the road, fled with a handful of followers into the desert and for a time retained his freedom. Next year he was killed in another fight, at Om Debrikat.

R. Talbot Kelly, born in 1861, is an artist who has lived much in Egypt and other lands of North Africa, and has specialized in the painting of Egyptian subjects and the study of Mohammedan art.



R. TALBOT KELLY

THE FLIGHT OF THE KHALIFA

one portion of the globe where virgin soil was to be found has been conveniently, if somewhat loosely, styled the Partition of Africa.

To attempt to describe in detail the ramifications and geographical niceties of this colossal international activity would be beyond the space at our disposal. The most that can be done is to offer an explanation of the occasions when British "spheres of influence" clashed with those of her neighbouring Powers, with resulting international complications.

This expression "sphere of influence" was a happy diplomatic shibboleth which was coined at the Congress of Berlin in 1884. This congress met primarily to discuss the status of the Congo Free State, but generally cleared the atmosphere for the laying down of some safe rules by which the colonizing rivalries of the European nations in Africa might proceed with as little international friction as possible. In this business of claim-staking it was to be a case of "hands off" if the right to a "sphere of influence" could be clearly proved. There should be elbow-room enough for all. The guiding principle was that there must have been an effective occupation of a territory before it could be considered a sphere of influence, and that any occupation of fresh territory must be duly notified to the signatory Powers.

In glancing at the map of Africa it will be seen that, from a territorial or geographical point of view, the biggest slice of the African cake has been taken by France; but this big slice, to pursue the metaphor, includes the currantless area of the Sahara. Nevertheless, in actual territory and spheres of influence France practically dominates the whole of North-West Africa, having recently, by the Treaty of Algeciras, obtained great concessions in Morocco.

The rivalry between Great Britain and France in West Africa has been very acute, and there have been several collisions which might have ended disastrously but for the tact and diplomatic ability displayed by both nations. From the first France's aim was to isolate the British colonies on the west coast and prevent any wedge of territory being thrust in between her west coast and Mediterranean possessions. By her admirable exploring expeditions she gradually pushed her way into the interior until she became mistress of the Upper Niger and the territory explored by Mungo Park. In 1893 Timbuktu was acquired, and the power of the warlike chief, Samory, who had defied French arms for fifteen years, was overcome in 1898. Dahomey was added to the French dominions in 1892. The rapid progress of the French in the Niger had alarmed British traders, and the United South African Company was formed to protect and promote British interests on the Lower Niger, the company eventually receiving a charter as the Royal Niger Company. By an adroit movement the interests of French traders in the Lower Niger were bought out, and British rule was consolidated. As has been already said, the British and French rivalry furnished uncomfortable incidents, but the episode of Bussa, in 1897, on the right bank of the Lower Niger, almost led to war between the two countries. Bussa was included in the territory of

the Royal Niger Company, and was consequently in a British sphere, but it was occupied by French troops, while irritating acts of aggression were constantly occurring, with the result that sometimes French and British flags were flying side by side. Fortunately the officers on both sides displayed tact, leaving the arrangements of the difficulties to the diplomatists of London and Paris. Lord Salisbury took a firm attitude, and a commission in Paris settled the points of difference. By the treaties of 1898 and 1904 the spheres of influence of both countries in these regions were amicably and definitely arranged. France obtained recognition of her claim to a great area in North-West Africa from Tunis to the Congo, and east and west from Lake Chad to Senegal.

In the rush for African lands Germany appeared upon the scene later than her rivals, so that her sudden desire to acquire colonies became embarrassing to the chanceries of Europe, who had grown to regard her as a non-colonizing power. Germany had at first sought a sphere of influence in Brazil, where there is a large German population, but she was warned off by the Monroe Doctrine, and was thus led to turn to Africa. The first impulse towards a forward colonial policy was given by the foundation of the German Colonial Society at Frankfort in 1882. This society received a semi-official blessing, and proceeded to send out its agents, many of whom were armed with promises and blank treaty forms. Colonial advance was to be made at the expense of Great Britain, and the indications of German designs are very marked about the year 1884. From 1884 to 1886 Bismarck started to "nag" the British lion in marked fashion, which possibly may have had some approval from the meeting of the three emperors (Russia, Germany, and Austria) at Skiernewice in 1884. Certainly Bismarck used British difficulties at this period in Afghanistan and Egypt to German advantage. The foundation of the German colony of South-West Africa may be said to be the first provocative attempt at British patience. The German activity in this region had been confined to efforts of missionaries in Damaraland, who, owing to want of tact, were so frequently in conflict with the natives that they were forced to appeal for German protection. The German Government more or less shelved the question of protection by throwing the onus of it on to the British Government. The reply of the British Government was vague; it regarded Damaraland and Namaqualand as undoubtedly in its sphere of influence, but, in accordance with the policy laid down in 1865, was not anxious—seeing that the European population was very small and German colonial aspirations, in their opinion, a negligible quantity—to increase British colonial expenses. Sir Bartle Frere at the Cape saw the inwardness of the German move, but pleaded in vain, though he was fortunate enough to secure Walfisch Bay for Great Britain in 1878.

Early in 1883 a Bremen merchant, Herr Lüderitz, established a factory and hoisted the German flag at Angra Pequena Bay, and was backed by a semi-official promise of support from Berlin. On informing Lord Granville of Lüderitz's design the German ambassador enquired if the locality were under British authority, and received a

very indecisive reply. There was considerable alarm at the Cape, where public men were quite awake to the German aims, and an influential deputation waited on the Foreign Secretary. But Lord Derby continued to treat German colonial policy as a negligible quantity, and gave a very guarded answer to a further German feeler as to the British sphere in Damaraland. The result was that Germany felt she was safe in giving the British lion another pin-prick; so an imperial pronouncement formally annexed Angra Pequena and its hinterland. A study of the map will show the proximity of this possession to the Boer republics, with whom the German colonial party had begun to flirt. From a small beginning the activities of Herr Lüderitz had gained a considerable tract of country for Germany, and the foundations of her South-West African colony were surely laid. Great Britain had awakened too late to the reality of German colonization, and, in spite of diplomatic growling, had to bow to the inevitable. Angra Pequena and district became German by the end of 1884.

After the activities of Herr Lüderitz we must pass on to those of Dr. Nachtigall. Dr. Nachtigall was recommended to the courtesy of the British Government as the representative of Germany sent out on behalf of her Foreign Office to enquire into the state of German commerce in West Africa. For some years there had been considerable activity of German traders and missionaries in the Gulf of Guinea, hitherto recognized as a purely British sphere of influence, and the various German factories on the coast were under British protection. Dr. Nachtigall arrived in the German cruiser *Möwe*, was everywhere courteously treated in accordance with his letter of recommendation by the British authorities, but promptly proceeded to make treaties with native chiefs and especially with the king of Togoland. For some time the Cameroon chiefs had asked for British protection, but this had, in pursuance of the British colonial policy of limiting expansion, been refused. But the events in Damaraland had awakened the British Government to the perils besetting it. It was hurriedly decided to push forward on the Guinea coast, and Consul Hewett was instructed to establish the British protectorate definitely in the Cameroons. H.M.S. *Flirt* steamed into the river some days too late, to find the *Möwe* had arrived before her, and the indefatigable Dr. Nachtigall with many treaties in his pocket. Consul Hewett, however, managed to save for his country the delta of the Niger, and the Oil Rivers from Rio del Rey as far as the Lagos frontier.

Great irritation was felt in this country over the high-handed methods of Dr. Nachtigall, but Bismarck had inflicted one more pin-prick. After the exchange of much thunder between Berlin and London the German sphere of interest in the Cameroons was fixed by the boundary line of the Rio del Rey and the Old Calabar River. Fortunately German activities on the Lower Niger, as well as those of the French, as we have just shown, were defeated by the ability and foresight of Sir George Taubman Goldie, who founded the Royal Niger Company, whose activities prospered so extensively that the pro-

tectorate was absorbed by the Crown under the style of Nigeria, which was eventually united with Lagos in 1906.

We will now turn to East Africa, and there we shall find that the actions of Germany provoked British patience more sorely than any of her other attempts at aggrandizement at the expense of the empire. In Zanzibar, British influence had been paramount; but about the year 1880 there arose a sudden and energetic movement of German merchants, chiefly controlled from Hamburg, and plans were formed to obtain concessions on the mainland. Previously, in 1878, the sultan of Zanzibar had offered the commercial control of all his mainland territories to Great Britain, but Lord Beaconsfield declined the protectorate. In November, 1884, Dr. Karl Peters with two companions arrived at Zanzibar, and, armed with a bundle of blank treaty forms and promises, disappeared into the hinterland of the mainland. Dr. Peters obtained his signatories and returned with claims on the mainland amounting to 60,000 square miles. The sultan was violently indignant, and on Lord Granville making representations to Berlin he received a curt reply denying all idea of establishing a protectorate in Zanzibar, yet in 1885 the German emperor proclaimed his suzerainty over Dr. Peters's treaty chiefs. Prince Bismarck had chosen his moment well; the country was on the verge of war with Russia over the Penjdeh incident, and our relations with France in West Africa were none too cordial. Moreover, Lord Granville's policy was exceedingly spiritless, and Sir John Kirk and British traders generally in Zanzibar were amazed to be told in so many words to undo their work by maintaining friendly relations with the Germans. In fact, the sultan required the presence of a German squadron before he would ratify these proceedings.

Meanwhile, possibly despairing of Government methods, in British fashion, private enterprise came to the rescue of national interests in East Africa. Mr. H. H. Johnston (now Sir Harry Johnston) had been exploring vigorously in the region round Mt. Kilimanjaro, and was endeavouring to open up that region. Sir Harry Johnston had acquired treaties with various chiefs, and these were transferred to Mr. Hutton of Manchester, who, with the assistance of Sir William Mackinnon and a large backing of influential merchants, chiefly from Manchester, founded the *Imperial British East Africa Company*. But again the interests of the British company clashed with those of Germany. Dr. Peters had also obtained concessions in the same district, and from the concessions sprang the *German East Africa Company*, with the weight of the German Government behind it, contrasting unfavourably with the protection offered to the British company from the home Government. Eventually an agreement was arrived at by the two powers, and Germany obtained the Kilimanjaro district, while the authority of the sultan of Zanzibar was defined. Britain got some compensation out of a bad deal by obtaining the lease of Mombasa, thus opening a way from the coast to Lake Victoria Nyanza.

On the fall of Bismarck in 1890 a more amicable feeling controlled

the relations of Great Britain and Germany with regard to African affairs, and the result of the treaty, in addition to a settlement of disputes in South Africa, was an immense cession of claims on the part of Germany to Great Britain. In exchange for the island rock of Heligoland, Germany recognized, with the exception of the Island of Mafia, the suzerainty of Great Britain in Zanzibar. By the same treaty the British occupation in Uganda was admitted, the colonization of this country having come into the sphere of the British East Africa Company. The hero of the British expedition in Uganda was Captain Lugard, who successfully balked the restless, if somewhat underhand, methods of Dr. Peters. By this treaty of 1890 the frontier of British East Africa was extended as far as the Congo Free State.

The Portuguese colonies in Africa, though the oldest established in the continent, owing to a variety of causes, among which misgovernment is the first, have not shared in the general activity and prosperity of more recently acquired colonies. Generally speaking, Portuguese and British relations in Africa have been good, with the exception of a passing cloud of ill feeling with regard to Mozambique and the attempt of the Portuguese to connect that colony with their western possessions in Angola. An effort was made to close the Zambezi in 1888, which was frustrated by the firmness of Lord Salisbury. Some uneasiness was caused in the following year by the news of a Portuguese expedition on the Zambezi. This was diplomatically explained away as a visit to the Portuguese settlements on the Upper Zambezi. Meanwhile Sir Harry Johnston had been made British consul at Mozambique, with instructions to enquire into the state of affairs on the Zambezi. To his surprise he found the expedition under Major Serpa Pinto moving northwards into a British sphere of influence. The Portuguese leader was at once warned of the gravity of his actions and returned to Mozambique for instructions, but his subordinate, Lieutenant Continho, crossed the Zambezi and made a raid on the Shiré district. The country was promptly placed under British protectorate and an ultimatum was addressed to Portugal. Prolonged negotiations followed, but ultimately a treaty was ratified in 1891 by which the spheres of the two countries on the Zambezi were defined, and for certain concessions Great Britain gained a large belt of country north of the Zambezi.

Again some friction arose with Portugal in regard to Delagoa Bay and the seaport of Lourenço Marques, a natural port for the Transvaal, which, had the British Government been sufficiently far-sighted, might have been, previous to the African boom, bought for a mere song. The points in dispute with regard to the lands adjoining Delagoa Bay were submitted to the arbitration of the French president, Marshal MacMahon, who decided against Great Britain, and awarded Portugal a district she had not expected. For some time Germany had been intriguing with the Boers for British discomfiture, and the activities of a certain Herr Einwold were utilized to lay a claim to St. Lucia Bay on the coast of Zululand. Acting on instructions from Lord Rosebery,

a British cruiser, H.M.S. *Goshawk*, steamed at full speed to St. Lucia Bay and hoisted the British flag. There was an angry roar from Berlin, which had not the least effect upon Lord Rosebery, and Germany retired from the contest after exacting important concessions in the Cameroons.

Amidst the lethargy and *laissez-aller* policy so often displayed by the British Government in colonial matters the one strong example of a determined and vigorous initiative was the annexation of Bechuanaland. For some time the Boers had attempted to push their way into this central region, which has been aptly styled "the key of Africa", with a view to preventing British colonization. Strong appeals for assistance were made from the tribes, and especially from Khama, the chief of the Bamangwato, and in 1878 a small expeditionary force under Colonel Warren (afterwards Sir Charles Warren) occupied Southern Bechuanaland. The first Boer war in 1882 gave a further impetus to the aggression of the Boers, who set up the republics of Goshen and Stellaland. This action caused great anxiety in South Africa, as the fear arose that Bechuanaland, of highest importance strategically and from a colonizing point of view, would be lost to the British. The Rev. John Mackenzie was sent out to treat with the chiefs and Boers, and, though he worked heroically, was not very successful. He gave way to a great man—Cecil Rhodes. Mr. Rhodes had to face enormous difficulties, as British prestige was at a low ebb. He suggested a suzerainty for Stellaland, but could make no headway in Goshen, and the Boers annexed the territory. This was a breach of the Convention of London, so Mr. Rhodes, with a powerful backing from Cape Colony, made vigorous and effective protests to Mr. Gladstone's Government, and Sir Charles Warren was again sent out with an expedition in 1884. Sir Charles, brushing aside the diplomatic efforts of "Oom Paul" at Modder River, effectively broke up the two republics and annexed Bechuanaland to the British Crown.

Before concluding this section there remain a few words to be said about the *Congo Free State*, the largest of the new African states. The Free State owes its origin to Leopold II, king of the Belgians, and the recognition he gave to the discoveries of the explorer, Sir H. M. Stanley. Originally the idea was to found a model tropical state of an international nature, in fact, a world-endowed chartered company; but the preponderant financial interests of King Leopold prevailed. In 1885 he concluded a treaty with America, and almost simultaneously with Great Britain. This treaty took place previous to the Congress of Berlin of the same year, which was, as we have noted, to settle, *inter alia*, the question of the Congo Free State. The congress resulted in the general recognition of the independence of the new state under the sovereignty of King Leopold.

The relationship between this country and the new state has on the whole been good, but about 1900 an agitation arose in English newspapers, and among certain publicists, concerning its administration. The Government had become too bureaucratic, its civil

service was ill-paid, with the result that the officials, unable to endure for many years an equatorial life, began to feather their nests at the expense of the natives. From extortion to cruelty is but a step, and there is strong evidence that the officials in many districts instituted a system of forced labour, with the result that atrocities against the natives were prevalent. A wave of indignation seized a certain section of the British public, and the original backers of the "model" state were horrified to note, as they thought, the unheard-of result of their idealism.

If at first the indignation and accusations hurled against the administration of the Free State were exaggerated—naturally to the disgust of earnest Belgian thought, which ascribed it to a Protestant source—a gradual feeling prevailed that all was not well within the state. Reluctantly, in 1909, and partly from financial necessity, the Belgian Government took over the direct parliamentary control of the Congo Free State, and from that time undoubted abuses have been gradually swept away, while a clean administration, in which the co-operation of the British and American consuls has been welcomed, has worked for the common good of native and settler.

CHAPTER IX

COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1870

It has been necessary to devote considerable space to British policy in Africa, north and south, because that policy has been interwoven with the history of the European nations. But the history of the three great dominions beyond the seas—the affairs of the Indian empire, save where they are concerned with the north-west frontier, scarcely come within the scope of this work—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, is one of domestic consolidation, which is only affected mildly by European jealousies, and yet slowly but surely joins in the welding process of British imperialism. The chief phenomenon with regard to these self-governing colonies in the last forty years has been the steady growth of their national life. From being dependent they gradually became independent, and have latterly contributed their share to imperial protection. Since the beginning of the twentieth century the dominions may be said to have been the allies and not the colonies of the mother country.

The occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1887 helped to bring about the first step towards this closer union with the colonies and the mother country in the matter of the burden of imperial responsibilities. The presence of so many distinguished colonials to do honour to the queen-empress made it possible to hold the first colonial conference. This conference met at the Foreign Office for the first time on 4 April, 1887. No ambitious schemes were mooted, and a sugges-

tion of definite imperial federation was firmly put on one side by Lord Salisbury. But the question of a closer union for imperial defence was discussed, with the satisfactory result that the Australian navy was increased, and the Australian Government undertook the cost of the new cruisers. From this modest beginning arose the important Imperial Council of to-day. After the jubilee year of 1887 sprang that new imperial spirit, by which the mother country recognized her responsibilities towards her colonies, and the colonies on their side understood the European responsibilities of the mother country.

The next important conference was held at Ottawa in 1894 and was chiefly occupied with three subjects: (1) the construction of a cable between Vancouver and Australia, (2) establishment of a fast mail service between Great Britain and Australia via Canada, (3) commercial relations of the colonies with Great Britain.

The Imperial Federation League, which was founded in 1888, did excellent spade work towards the closer imperial understanding of to-day. The responsible committee was composed of eminent statesmen and public men, and their deliberations carried weight. The league sought to bring all the outlying colonies together, and recommended the appointment of colonials to positions of emolument and trust outside their own country, and the inclusion of colonial judges in the Privy Council. But a constitutionally regulated imperial federation is still a dream, although it is one that year by year seems more likely to be realized; for the evolution that is creating the self-supporting nationalism of the dominions will also create a demand for a fuller share in the control of British imperial policy. The strongest note in this direction of the assertion of colonial loyalty, but at the same time of new-born nationalism, was struck at the important colonial conference held under the auspices of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in 1902. The Boer War had just been concluded, and the magnificent display of loyalty throughout the empire during the conflict was a happy augury for the success of the conference. But, it has to be confessed, the result was disappointing to the ardent imperialists at home, who desired more than the outward signs of federation. Mr. Chamberlain asked for a closer fiscal union, that, by the imposing of reciprocal tariffs, should make the empire as a whole independent of foreign food, and that the colonies should take a greater share in the burden of imperial armament. It soon became apparent that the conference was not unanimous in its outlook. There were some representatives with strong national views—that is to say, they were deeply interested in the independent development of the national life of their own colonies, and consequently found the attitude of the Colonial Office repressive; while there were others, chiefly the younger dependencies, who were quite content with the customary colonial point of view.

“For at this conference the nationalist leaders, knowing how the war had stimulated colonial patriotism, at length felt strong enough to make a firm stand against the repressive tendencies of that official



Earl of Eglon, Colonial Secretary

Hon. A. Deakin
N.A.A.F.C. SECRETARY
N.A.A.F.C. (Australia)

Gen. Botha
(S. Africa)

THE GREAT COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907

The above is intended merely as a portrait group, and does not show any particular meeting of the Conference

imperialism which the loyalty of the younger colonies seemed really to encourage and support. So, for the first time, a division appears in the ranks of the self-governing colonies. The nations are ranged against the colonies; the forces of patriotism against the forces of loyalty; and the mother country, at length realizing that the difference is vital, is being called upon to determine which side it is her best interest to support."¹

On the subject of closer fiscal relations, or colonial preference, there was no unanimity shown. There was a great willingness to meet Mr. Chamberlain's proposals, and in some cases preference was offered without reciprocity; but the question could only develop into a tentative discussion, inasmuch as the idea of a colonial commercial interdependence had not emanated from the colonies themselves. Further progress was made in the matter of imperial defence, and dominions and principal colonies all increased their grant; but their contributions were mainly directed to self-support or alliance, in preference to a mere subsidy to the mother country. Before the conference closed two useful resolutions were passed, to hold an Imperial Council every four years, with the establishment of a permanent secretariat for colonial affairs, and that Government contracts should be placed imperially wherever possible.

It is now time to pass on to a brief account of the chief events in the history of the three great self-governing dominions—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand since 1870.

CANADA.—The modern history of Canada dates from 1 July, 1867, when the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick were confederated as the Dominion of Canada. In 1870 a considerable portion of the Hudson's Bay territories was purchased and the new province of Manitoba was formed, which caused a rebellion among the half-breeds of the Red River district, who were led by Louis Riel. This rebellion was quelled by Colonel Garnet Wolseley, later to be the hero of Tel-el-Kebir. In 1871 British Columbia joined the federation, one of the conditions of union being the building of a transcontinental railway. A variety of causes prevented the accomplishment of this project, but the first contracts for the famous Canadian Pacific Railway were signed in 1880, and the system developed with such marvellous rapidity that it was completed in 1886. To-day, with its operations extending over 11,500 miles of road, it may be described as the greatest railway system in the world. The inter-colonial railway, joining up the maritime provinces with the St. Lawrence, was opened in 1876. In 1878 an order passed in the Canadian Parliament annexing all the British possessions in North America to the Dominion, with the exception of Newfoundland. Owing to the extraordinary development of Manitoba the Saskatchewan territory was annexed, and this led to the second half-breed insurrection under Riel, which was easily subdued by a Canadian force under General Middleton. Riel was captured, tried, and duly executed. This

¹ Richard Jebb's *Studies in Colonial Nationalism*, p. 136.

little expedition is interesting because it was entirely Canadian work, and shows the rapid development of national independence; for the first Riel trouble had been put down by British troops. In 1905 the North-West Provinces were divided into two new provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan. The long-standing fisheries dispute with the United States was settled in 1882, while in 1892 a treaty of arbitration was concluded between Great Britain, Canada, and the United States with regard to the rights of seal-fishing off Alaska and in the Behring Sea. On the outbreak of hostilities in South Africa, Canadian loyalty supplied three contingents of troops, and in 1909 the Dominion undertook to assist in the naval defence of the empire.

With regard to foreign affairs, Canadian diplomacy of recent years has chiefly been confined to the relations between the Dominion and her powerful neighbour, the United States. The idea of annexation had always been present to the minds of American statesmen, and, sooner or later, it was thought that Canada would fall a victim to the bad old *laissez-aller* ways of the Colonial Office and be absorbed in the union. Canadian nationality was regarded as a mere expression at Washington, and the fact of its virile existence was for a long time scouted. But Canada, since the federation, has developed along her own lines, with a keen sympathy for the mother country and a knowledge of her own worth and destiny. "Indeed it may be said that Canadian nationalism was founded upon a repugnance to American nationalism."¹ Canadian patriotism considered her constitution and culture equal, if not superior, to that of her neighbour.

The first affair with the United States that the new Dominion had to face was the Fenian incursions of 1866 and 1870, which caused a strong military force to be called out. The damages for this violation of international law, as has been already noted, was subjected among other matter for consideration between Great Britain and the United States at the time the *Alabama* claim was being discussed. But far the most important dispute between the two countries was that occasioned by the Alaska Boundary dispute.

In 1825 Russia, the original owner of Alaska, came to an arrangement with Great Britain as to the boundaries. Russia's chief interests lay in seal-catching, Britain's in furs (Hudson's Bay Company), consequently the Russian sphere of activities was on the coast and the British in the hinterland. In adjusting the boundaries, therefore, a long fringe of coast, stretching southward for several hundred miles, was awarded to Russia. In 1867 the United States purchased Alaska from Russia with her treaty rights, while the British Government looked on.

On the discovery of gold in Klondike in 1898 there was naturally a great rush of miners from Canada, who found the front door to their own domain barred by American customs officers in Alaskan territory. From the small scrap of coast that belonged to the Dominion a way was open to the goldfields along the Lynn Canal, a narrow inlet which at its head

¹ Jebb's *Studies in Colonial Nationalism*.

branches into two arms, the western one forming Pyramid Harbour and the eastern two harbours, easy of access, Skagway and Dyea, which were American settlements. On looking up the treaty the Canadians came to the conclusion that grave doubts existed as to the validity of the American occupation, as the boundary-line was an artificial one, and it was a question if it followed a straight direction or pursued the contour of the coast. The Dominion Government accordingly put in their claim, and a burst of jingoism in the United States was the result. The Canadian asked for arbitration without restriction, and for the simultaneous settling of three other outstanding questions in dispute—Atlantic Fishers, Dingley Tariff, and Alien Labour Laws. A joint commission met at Quebec. The Americans were used to obtaining concessions from a British Government, and came to the meeting in an arrogant spirit. This behaviour was, however, of no avail with the Canadians, who were determined to wring concession for concession. All the points in dispute were arranged except the Alaska boundary, which the Americans wanted to hold over, but the Canadians stood firm for all or nothing.

The Americans agreed to establishing an arbitration court of three British representatives and three Americans; but, in any case, demanded the recognition of their right to Skagway and Dyea. Accordingly the commission broke up, and a furious press campaign arose. But the failure of the commission had the effect of opening the eyes of American politicians to the reality of Canadian nationality.

A new convention met in 1903, supposed to be composed of "six impartial jurists of repute"; but the American nominees—Senators Lodge and Turner and Mr. Root—were notorious anti-Canadians, and it became obvious that the Americans feared an international testing of their claim. The Canadian side consisted of Sir Louis Felte, Mr. Aylesworth, K.C., and Lord Alverstone. The Americans had secured their interests by their jurists; they would yield nothing, and the award went against Canada, after a vigorous protest by the Canadian representatives. In fact, the award caused a bitter feeling in Canada; it was felt that national affairs had been sacrificed to the imperial tradition of remaining good friends with the United States. The premier, Sir Wilfred Laurier, a loyal imperialist and great Canadian, in Parliament announced the necessity of applying to the British Parliament for greater powers. "If ever we have to deal with matters of a similar nature again we shall deal with them in our own fashion and according to the best light we have."

AUSTRALIA.—If the development of Canada has been subjected from the first to the vicissitudes of international pressure, that of Australia has been exactly the reverse. She for a long time remained immune in her island continent, and the union of her separate colonial states grew nearer through commercial facilities and not through nationalism. The advent of European powers in the Southern Pacific awakened her to her danger, and but for this event the six states of Australia might have been content to remain separate colonies. Australian federation has

always been favoured by the mother country, and successive attempts were made to bring it about. In 1881 an intercolonial conference was held to devise measures to prevent the alarming increase of Chinese immigration, and in 1885 a Federal Council of Australasia, which was purely deliberative, was formed, to which for a few years Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Tasmania sent representatives, although New South Wales and New Zealand held aloof. In 1887 it was agreed to send a mutual subsidy to the home Government for naval defence on the coast. Sir Henry Parkes, in 1889, proposed "a great national government for all Australia", being convinced of the need of it on the grounds of national defence. A meeting was held in Melbourne, and the proceedings went so far as to drafting a bill; but the scheme fell through, as such schemes will, owing to the want of a popular mandate.

The federation movement increased in weight by the conventions of 1891 and 1894, while a meeting of premiers of 1895 brought the scheme into the region of practical politics; finally, a Bill was drafted in 1898 which was submitted to a referendum in the various colonies. The biggest opposition to the Bill was met with in New South Wales and Queensland, but, nevertheless, it passed both legislatures. By an Act of Parliament the Federation of Australia was recognized by the British Government, and on 1 January, 1901, the six Australian colonies were federated under the title of the Commonwealth of Australia. Lord Hopetoun became the first governor-general, and the first Commonwealth Parliament was opened in state by King George and Queen Mary, who were then Duke and Duchess of York.

NEW ZEALAND.—After the Maori wars the colony developed at a great pace, a progress which was hastened by the "Public Works Policy" of Sir Julius Vogel, and his system of large loans. In 1879 the Vogel policy collapsed, and there followed a period of great depression in which taxes were extremely high. From 1882 to 1890 the supreme political leader was Sir Harry Atkinson, who pulled the country together after the disastrous Vogel regime. Sir Harry Atkinson's party was overthrown by the Progressives under John Ballance; the influence of the Labour party began to increase, and culminated in the leadership of that remarkable man, Richard Seddon, afterwards Sir Richard Seddon, who was premier from 1893 to 1906. Sir Richard Seddon presided over the nation with conspicuous ability, and during his administration much useful, and some highly contentious, legislation was accomplished, such as Alcoholic Liquor Control, Women's Franchise, Advances to Settlers Act, and the Arbitration Act.

New Zealand during the Boer War showed herself very enthusiastic for the imperial cause, by dispatching two contingents, amounting to 6000 men, and afterwards contributing to the Australasian naval squadron. In 1907, owing to its rapid growth in wealth and enterprise, the colony was raised to the dignity of a dominion.

PART II

Pan-Germanism

CHAPTER X

THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE

After the disorders of war must come the orderliness of peace; the might of arms had proclaimed the new German empire, it rested with the arts of peace to consolidate it. By his brilliant diplomacy, which had contributed as much as the organization of von Roon and the tactics of von Moltke to the final victory, Prince Bismarck emerged supreme minister, and the history of the next twenty years is the history of his sway. On the conclusion of the Treaty of Frankfort the Chancellor found himself with five thousand million francs to spend for the national good, and practically the institutions of the new empire to create. In a manner of speaking, the mere outside walls of the fabric had been built, the internal machinery had to be installed. In 1871 each state had its own legal system and coinage, railways, and a control of its army, all of which stood in the way of a close union. Gradually a uniform legal system was instituted, and a supreme Imperial Court of Appeal was established at Leipzig.

The empire is composed of twenty-six states, and the emperor is head of this confederation owing to his position as King of Prussia. He is chief commander of the imperial army and navy, and makes war or concludes peace in the name of the whole empire. The control of the Government is nominally vested in the Bundesrat or "Federal Council", a small assembly of fifty-eight members with administrative and legislative powers, and the Reichstag or "Imperial Diet", which is the equivalent for a German House of Commons.

One of the earliest reforms was to place the Post Office under imperial control, and found a standardized coinage. An effort was made to nationalize the railways, but the jealousy of the independent states caused the delay of this necessary measure for some years. The internal government also presented difficulties; all the component states of the federation were not German in origin, and some resented their inclusion. There was always the open wound of Alsace-Lorraine to heal, and the Poles of Prussian Poland steadily refused to be

Germanized. Hanover and Brunswick still had to be won from the Guelf cause.

The eyes of Europe were upon the empire, and anxiety was manifested as to how this new central military power would behave. From the first, Bismarck endeavoured to show his peaceable intentions; the nation was satiated with conquest and needed time to settle down. Peace was as important to German interests as war had been. It was absolutely vital that no coalition should be formed against the empire, so to prevent this France must be isolated and the chance of a war of revenge minimized. France was recognized as the enemy, that was only natural; so good relations must be cultivated between the two powerful neighbours, Russia and Austria. Throughout the war the fear of neutral intervention that might baulk the Prussians of a full victory had haunted Bismarck, and his tireless diplomatic ability was directed to the prevention of this object. Russia, as we have seen, was kept occupied by her repudiation of the Black Sea clause of the Treaty of Paris, and the diplomatic affair her action caused with Great Britain; Austria and Italy were successfully played against each other, but a threat to restore the temporal power of the Pope did much to extinguish Italian leanings towards France. Bismarck in the early days of the empire always managed to flourish adroitly before Russian eyes the scare of Polish liberty, and before Italian the vision of ultra-montanism. But the cardinal point of his diplomatic creed was friendship with Russia. He had foreseen that a Russian alliance with France "was in the nature of things", and so long as he remained at the helm of state he strove with might and main to prevent the accomplishment of such an understanding. The moderate use of the victory of Sadowa, and the non-interference of the new empire in the affairs of German Austria, allayed the suspicions of the Emperor Franz Josef and rendered practicable a *rapprochement* with the dual empire. Thus in September, 1872, Bismarck was able to bring about a meeting in Berlin of the emperors of Russia and Austria with the venerable Emperor William. The meeting, although popularly known as "The Three Emperors' League", did not result in a definite alliance, but there arose an excellent understanding between the three monarchs. During the course of the next year a treaty was concluded between the German Emperor and the Emperor of Russia, which was of a purely military nature.

One of the first crises which required the titanic energy of Bismarck to overcome was that occasioned by the dispute with the Catholic Church, generally alluded to as the *Kultur-Kampf*, which lasted ten years. This challenge to Rome originated from a suspicion of ultra-montane intrigue to re-establish the Empire in France. The strong liberal tendencies that lay at the foundation of the new empire, a liberalism which in reality was very shortlived, were supposed not to be agreeable to the Vatican, and the Church's policy in Poland led Bismarck to believe that the attitude of Catholicism was anti-German. He determined to clip the wings of clericalism. The Jesuits were expelled and laws were passed to restrict the power of the clergy, who

were deprived of their right of inspecting schools. Further, it was enacted that all German offices of emolument in the Church must be held by Germans, and the State was to have the power of appointment. Pope Pius IX by the Bull *Quod Nunquam* fulminated against these proceedings, and the State replied by the suppression of all religious orders, the measures being enacted with such severity that six Prussian bishops were imprisoned and 1300 parishes were without public worship. The effect was to stiffen the resolution of the Catholic laity, and the powerful Centre party, which subsequently was to have such weight in the State, came into being under the leadership of Windhorst. The Catholic laity rallied to the call of their Church, and the result was the awakening of Catholic political life by the foundation of societies and influential newspapers. Meanwhile a greater danger had arisen to Prussian autocracy in the rapid development of the Social Democrats, consequently Bismarck, who had perceived his mistake, was glad to seize the opportunity of the death of Pius IX, in 1878, to make his peace with the new Pope, Leo XIII, and bring an end to the unedifying *Kultur-Kampf*.

The new Army Bill passed by the French Government in 1875 occasioned great anxiety in Germany. The rapid recovery of France from her heavy defeats in 1870-1 was unprecedented in modern history. The huge indemnity imposed upon her had been paid in an incredibly short time, the application of the Government for a loan having been subscribed seven times over, and the army of occupation had left French soil. Further, the stability of the Third Republic had been a surprise to Bismarck, who desired to see France with a weak government. Consequently there was an ominous rattling of sabres at Berlin when it became known that the French army was to be augmented by adding a fourth battalion to each regiment, and the feeling was prevalent in Germany that France the vanquished had been let off too lightly. Bismarck's representations were couched in such threatening terms as almost to amount to an ultimatum. The clouds of war were gathering. But Russia and Great Britain came to the rescue; they desired to maintain a strong France, and it was politely but emphatically stated at Berlin that neither country would consent to see France bled white. Bismarck had been bluffing; his real intentions were pacific. He was glad to climb down and, possibly, to administer a snub to the ubiquitous Prussian military party.


On the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War in 1876 Bismarck determined to observe the strictest neutrality, and when after the Treaty of San Stefano he suggested the holding of a Congress at Berlin he desired, as he said, to act the part of an honest broker, so that the German influence should not be exerted on either side. The Chancellor's object was to obtain an advertisement for a pacific Germany satiated with conquest; certainly the fact of the Congress being held at Berlin was an acknowledgment of the position of the new empire and a personal triumph for himself. Unfortunately Russia was not satisfied with his broker's offices, and left the Congress smarting with a sense of humilia-

tion at being deprived of the fruits of victory, moreover, she openly accused Germany of ingratitude for her neutral services during the war with France.

This rebuff caused Bismarck to look towards Austria. He had laid his plans well by sagacious diplomacy in the complicated relations of the dual empire, and a treaty of alliance with Austria—but not without opposition from the Emperor William himself, who desired to be loyal to the traditional friendship of his house for Russia—was signed. The die had been cast; it was a question of choice between Russia and Austria, for Russian policy in the Balkans made a triple alliance between the three empires quite impossible. The choice in the circumstances of the time was a wise one. The alliance healed the wounds caused by 1866, and, on account of the Germanic element in Austria, was popular with the German nation.

The early years of the new empire had been under the ægis of Liberalism, although that party had never enjoyed a whole-hearted support from the supreme Bismarck; but now a reaction had set in, and the Chancellor was anxious to consolidate the material needs of the nation on lines inimical to Liberal policy. In fact, now that unity had been won, Liberalism was hampering his actions: the time had come to rule. The rise of the Social Democrats gave him the chance he sought. This party—ever a thorn in the side of Prussian bureaucracy—had been established about fifteen years, and its first mentors were Karl Marx, Fredrieoh Engels, and Ferdinand Lassalle, but it was under the brilliant leadership of Bebel that the Social Democrats ultimately found their parliamentary solidarity. During the year 1878 the emperor's life was twice attempted by criminals infected with Socialist doctrine. After the first attempt Bismarck brought in a penal law against the Social Democrats, which was thrown out by the Liberals, and a few days later a second attempt—and this time with injury to the monarch—was made on the emperor. Bismarck promptly dissolved the Reichstag, and in the election that followed the Liberals lost their leadership of the House. Having adroitly shelved the Liberals, Bismarck brought in a new penal law of great severity against the Social Democrats, and this passed the Reichstag. It was operative for two and a half years, and was several times reinforced. The severity by which the law was carried out defeated its object. The masses resented the curtailment of their liberties, and, although the organization of the party was for the time being destroyed, it was only to rise under Bebel to greater political strength.

In 1879, with a weakened Liberal resistance, Bismarck was enabled to undertake the far-reaching financial reforms he had been contemplating for some time. By the constitution the produce of customs and excise belonged to the empire, and the deficit on a basis of population had to be made good by the independent states. The policy of free trade had diminished the revenue from customs and excise, and the burden of the individual states increased. The rulers of the independent states stoutly objected to a system of direct taxation, which they considered



KARL MARX

From a photograph



FRIEDRICH ENGELS

From a photograph



FERDINAND LASSALLE

From a photograph



AUGUST BEBEL

From a photograph by Bieber

would be tantamount to an imperial interference into the domain of their own sovereignty. To ensure an increase of imperial revenue without friction with the federal states, Bismarck saw that a general tariff on imports was a necessity. Nevertheless, he did not carry his measure without considerable opposition, and success was only achieved by a coalition between the agrarians and the manufacturers. From this time agriculture and manufacture became the especial objects of imperial care.

The year 1880 saw the end of the *Kultur-Kampf*, and henceforth Bismarck could rely upon the support of the powerful Centre party against the attacks of the Liberals, especially in measures that were federal in their character. About this time the nationalizing of the railways took a stronger development, so that by the end of the century there were only left about two thousand miles of privately owned lines. Great attention was paid to the canal system, which was marvellously developed, and the important rivers Rhine, Elbe, Oder, and Weser were all connected by waterways: the great naval Kiel Canal was begun in 1887.

During the 'eighties, Bismarck was concerned in effecting some drastic domestic reforms, all with a view to counteracting the efforts of Socialism, amongst which by far the most important were the compulsory insurance schemes. In 1883 insurance against illness became compulsory, followed in 1884 by the law of insurance against accidents. The old-age and incapacity insurance became law in 1889. Measures were also passed for the improvement of artisans' dwellings and for the establishment of savings banks. The trade of the empire was encouraged by government bounties, especially for the development of the mercantile marine.

It is now time to return to Bismarck's foreign policy. When he concluded the alliance with Austria, his eyes were frequently turned to the newly founded kingdom of Italy, rapidly acquiring strength and already in the possession of a respectable navy. Germany, Austria, and Italy in alliance would make a formidable bulwark in Central Europe, and by ensuring peace between Austria and Italy would enhance the value of the Austrian alliance. Naturally Italy was inclined towards France, from ties of kinship, and more especially from gratitude for French assistance in her war of liberation. But the acquisition of Tunis by France, which Italy regarded as her own sphere of influence, had alienated Italian sympathy and driven her into the arms of Germany and Austria. The alliance was to endure for five years, but was renewed at periods for twenty years; and, in fact, had, until the outbreak of the great world war, been regarded as permanently fixed. Although Bismarck had accomplished a pet scheme in driving a solid wedge through Central Europe, he still approached Russia in a friendly spirit. Another meeting of the three emperors took place at Skiernewice in September, 1884, from which the Chancellor came away with assurances of Russian neutrality; and it may be conceded that, so long as he remained in power, the relations between

Germany and Russia were good. In fact at this period Bismarck may be said to have reached the zenith of his diplomatic career. Berlin had become the "clearing-house" of Europe; German policy was peaceable, France was isolated without feeling slighted, and Great Britain found the Triple Alliance suited her Mediterranean plans; moreover, German colonial or world policy had not become aggressive.

It may be remarked that colonial expansion had very little attraction for Bismarck, as he preferred to make doubly sure the Continental foundations of the empire before embarking on adventures overseas; but, if he was forced to give a hearing to the newly formed and very active German Colonial Association (1882), at any rate he never contemplated a German assertion of "world power". The sudden interest taken in African affairs by the Continent of Europe, already explained in the chapter on "The Partition of Africa", found Germany ready, fortunately at a time when her relations with France were good. In 1884, by establishing a trading station at Angra Pequena Bay, she laid the foundation of her South-West African colony, and the notorious Dr. Peters, by methods already narrated, established German influence in East Africa. In 1884 and 1885 territory was acquired in New Guinea, and the Caroline Islands were seized; but as these were claimed by Spain, Bismarck agreed to arbitration by the Pope—Leo XIII—who awarded them to Spain, but eventually they passed into German hands by purchase. As has been seen, German colonial pretensions in Africa sometimes led to friction, so in 1885 a conference was summoned to Berlin, and the rules of the game for the partition of Africa were laid down. In 1890 Great Britain exchanged Heligoland for concessions in Zanzibar.

The bad feeling that existed between Russia and Austria was increased by the Pan-Slavonic programme of the former Power, which was bound to offend a nation with large Slav interests, and the eagerness of France to obtain an alliance caused Bismarck considerable anxiety. "I will not live between two enemies," he said. The Chancellor again approached Russia and managed to secure a fresh agreement with her, which was generally known as the "re-insurance compact". This understanding was kept secret from the partners of the Triple Alliance; at the same time he carried on an active colonization scheme in Poland, which was welcome to St. Petersburg statesmen. This diplomatic coup was Bismarck's last success before the reins of power fell from his grasp.

In 1888 the old Emperor William died, and with him died the old order of things. He was succeeded by the Crown Prince, who assumed the title of Frederick III. The new emperor was known to be of pronounced Liberal views, and regarded the domestic policy of Bismarck with disfavour. But his efforts had been spent in the shade of heir-apparency, and when called to the throne he was already stricken with cancer. His tragic reign of a hundred days of suffering nobly borne endeared him to the German people, but had no effect upon their

history. The emperor but once asserted his will, in the dismissal of Puttkammer, a parliamentary colleague of the Iron Chancellor.

CHAPTER XI

GERMAN WORLD POLICY

Frederick III was succeeded by his eldest son, and with his accession as William II begins the modern era of Germany, the era of expansion and world policy, and the pretensions of Pan-Germanism. This new policy is in many respects the direct reversal of that of Bismarck, who seldom mentioned the idea of German world expansion. The chief thing he strove for was the consolidation of the German hegemony in Europe, and what encouragement he gave to colonial aspirations arose from an opinion that, if there were movements in the world, Germany should lay some claim to a share in them; for he saw clearly that a heavy scheme of colonization would be too great a burden for the new empire, which, owing to its federal character, was not too strongly financed.

After the federation of the empire the national prosperity increased by leaps and bounds; the war indemnity was utilized to good purpose on public works and in fostering private enterprise. But the most serious problem has been the increase of population. In 1870 the population of Germany was some 40 millions, in 1890 49 millions, in 1900 56 millions, and in 1910 65 millions. Germany was feeling the narrowness of her borders; it seemed impossible to provide employment for all her population, and unless the export trade of the country could be highly developed—for Germany, like Great Britain, has progressed more and more industrially, the relative importance of agriculture becoming correspondingly less—there was nothing for it but to expand, or face the fact of emigration on a large scale. To-day the value of German trade is only second to that of Great Britain, and “an agricultural country at the beginning of the last century, Germany is on the way to becoming a colossal industrial and capitalistic state . . . less able to nourish her own population”.¹

To the German mind, there is ever present the fact that her greatness has been developed by three successful wars, and militarism has always weighed in the councils of the State. Militarism was kept in its place by Prince Bismarck, who believed in the truth that the best interests of a state are served by successful diplomacy; but the new emperor may be said to have identified himself with the army from the very beginning of his reign. His first pronouncement was not to his people but to his army. He was an ardent admirer of his grandfather, in whom he saw, as the victor of Sadowa and Sedan, the champion of German unity. The future of the newer German *welt-politik* lay with

¹ Henri Lichtenberger's *The Evolution of Modern Germany*.

the army and the great Hohenzollern dynasty. The development from the recognition of the necessity of expansion by the acquiring of colonies for the surplus population to the grandiose scheme of world dominion was gradual but sure. It may truly be said that the nation's head had been turned by success, and the worship of "force" became a creed which was fostered by hosts of so-called patriotic societies, and especially by the writings of Nietzsche and Treitschke. "Both alike made war their watchword; both alike loved war, and striving for mastery and subdual, both hated England."¹ The will to power became an obsession with the German mind, which, fed by the writings of these philosophers, dreamers, and military scientists, saw in itself a race apart, a people superior to the rest of mankind. Pan-Germanism, from being an assertion of the necessity for amalgamating all that was German in Europe—in Austria, the Baltic provinces of Russia, Switzerland, Holland, and Flemish Belgium—became through the sway of militarism a call to impose the so-called superior German culture—or rather *Kultur*—upon the whole world. In other words, this may be said to be the military excuse to carve out colonial expansion at the expense of the two great colonial powers, France and Great Britain. There sprang into being in Prussia a school of historians, of whom Treitschke is the greatest example, whose incessant care it was to glorify the kingdom of Prussia—the chosen kingdom of Germany—and inculcate a hatred of Great Britain, a hatred to which even the great Bismarck lent his name; for he never forgave the letter of Queen Victoria to the aged emperor in 1875, and the Liberal reactionary politics of the then Crown Prince he attributed to his talented wife who had been Princess Royal of England. From the accession of the Emperor William II the development of this arrogant dream of German world dominion has, even if at times hidden by the pacific and correct attitude of diplomacy, been slow but deliberate. In fanning the flame of German lust of power and hatred of Great Britain, at any rate, it may be conceded that the semi-official blessing has always been there. The mass of warlike literature and preponderance of Pan-Germanic societies prove conclusively the trend of popular thought.

The first actions of the new emperor were scarcely marked by filial respect. Somewhat gratuitously, Puttkammer, who had been dismissed by his father, was restored to office and rewarded with a seat in the Upper House; and Bismarck's interference with regard to the late emperor's diaries received the imperial approval. It soon became apparent that the emperor possessed a masterly character that was impatient of direction. As quite a young man he had sat at the feet of the mighty Bismarck, and professed himself a devoted disciple of the master; but he had scarcely been on the throne two years before he contemplated the idea of ridding himself of the services of the unifier of Germany. There was no room for two men with insatiable love of power at the head of affairs. The official cause of the rupture was probably a difference of opinion concerning the policy of the emperor in foreign affairs

¹ Ernest Barker, M.A. *Nietzsche and Treitschke*. (Oxford Pamphlets.)

and with regard to the labour question, the actual cause was the dominant personality of Bismarck himself; he was undoubtedly usurping some of the privileges of the crown. The threat of resignation which had so often proved effective to the accomplishment of his will with the old emperor was taken literally by the new. The closing scenes were undignified for both men, and the manner of dismissal was felt by the German nation to be a great scandal. Bismarck retired to Friedrichsruh to a life of repining, threats, and grumbles, and it was only on the occasion of his eightieth birthday that a reconciliation between the emperor and himself was patched up. He was succeeded as Chancellor by General von Caprivi, a soldier of the old school, with an absolute obedience to the monarch as if to his military chief. Henceforth William II was his own master, and his speeches at the time show his exalted idea of his divine right to rule. The result was that his subjects at first could hardly take him seriously, especially as his vanity gave way to pomp and display and spectacular progress in foreign lands; satire and laughter had to be overcome by a too frequent use of trials for *lèse majesté* or *majestätsbeleidigung*.

In spite of the emperor's efforts to curry favour with the working classes the Social Democrats continued to wax stronger, and they obtained a triumph in the repeal of the oppressive Acts against them. Caprivi's chief work was the conclusion of commercial treaties with Austria-Hungary, Russia, Rumania, and Italy, in which the duties on corn were lowered in exchange for concessions. These treaties met with the violent opposition of the agrarians, who joined the enemies of the new administration, and Caprivi was forced to resign. In foreign affairs the patient work of Bismarck was undone; German relations with Russia grew cooler, while the emperor drew closer to Great Britain, and seized the opportunity, as has already been related, of obtaining Heligoland in exchange for important African concessions in Zanzibar and Uganda (1 July, 1890). In the light of recent events the exchange was not so disproportionate as the public opinion of the time considered. Heligoland has proved a veritable tower of strength to the German navy. Further departures from Bismarckian policy were made when the "reinsurance compact" with Russia was not renewed and his Polish policy was reversed. The result was France's gain, and the recluse of Friedrichsruh had the mortification of seeing what on earth he most dreaded—a Franco-Russian alliance an accomplished fact. The Dual Alliance counterbalanced the Triple Alliance, and simultaneously the period of the armed peace and German world policy began.

The year 1895 marks the advent of Germany as a great naval power. The creation of a navy was the darling scheme of the emperor; to him had been handed by his ancestors a mighty army, to his descendants he wished to bequeath a formidable navy. The completion of the Kiel Canal in this year threw open the Baltic as a safe naval base. In 1897 a great naval programme was carried through the Reichstag, and the gauntlet was thrown down to Great Britain. The flame of naval activity was fanned by the recently formed "*Flotte-Verein*" (Naval Union).

Also in the year 1895 the emperor made his first essay in *welt-politik* and joined France and Russia in an expedition to force Japan to give up the possession of the Liao-Tung Peninsula, which was conceded her by the Treaty of Shimonoseki after her successful war with China. It was contended that the possession by the Japanese of the peninsula would jeopardize the permanent peace of the Far East. German motives for joining in the oppression of Japan seem obscure; but probably it was an attempt to sterilize the recent Franco-Russian alliance.¹ The murder of certain German missionaries by the Chinese afforded the emperor a chance to dispatch a squadron to Chinese waters under the command of his brother, Prince Henry of Prussia, to strengthen his grip on Kiao-Chau, which had been leased to the empire as compensation. The emperor chose the occasion of the "send-off" to indulge in a speech of bombastic arrogance, in which Prince Henry was alluded to as "the mailed fist" of the German might. And in no less theatrical terms in 1900 he dispatched Count von Waldersee as Generalissimo—after much intriguing had gained this honour for Germany—of the international force to quell the Boxer rebellion in Peking. On this occasion the Germans were to be as devastating Huns.

Ever on the look-out for that place in the sun and sphere of influence for the cultivation of a world policy, after establishing German influence in the Far East the emperor turned his attention to the Near East. He coveted the resources of Asia Minor and especially of the western part. In 1898 he set out on a voyage to the Orient, touching at ports in Morocco on the way, and posing as the champion of oppressed Mohammedans. At Constantinople he was received by the sultan and was effusive in his professed friendship, at a time when the crimes of Abdul Hamid were especially obnoxious in the eyes of Europe. Then followed a journey into Syria full of pageantry and splendour, the net result of which was the concession to German financiers of the Bagdad railway, and to German militarism the reconstruction of the Ottoman army.

Prince Hohenlohe, owing to advancing years, resigned the chancellorship in 1900, and was succeeded by Prince von Bülow, who since 1897 had been Foreign Secretary. The new Chancellor soon showed himself to be a parliamentarian of resource, and the ablest director of affairs since Bismarck. He was early in trouble with the agrarians over the imposition of a new tariff on the renewal of the various commercial treaties which had been made by Caprivi. An election ensued in which the new tariff met with much hostile criticism, and the Social Democrats gained more seats. In 1904 there was a serious revolt of the Hereros against German rule in South-West Africa. A great difficulty was experienced in quelling the rebellion, and it is interesting to note that some assistance was lent by Great Britain, while the cost and losses of the German expedition were quite out of proportion to its importance. There was something of the nature of an uproar in the Reichstag, in which the

¹ J. Holland Rose's *Development of the European Nations*, p. 578.




GENERAL VON CAPRIVI



PRINCE HOHENLOHE


From photographs by Bieber

THE FOUR



PRINCE VON BULOW

From a photograph



DR. VON BETHMANN-HOLLWEG

From a photograph by Bieber

GERMAN CHANCELLORS SINCE BISMARCK

Centre party and the Social Democrats combined against the Government. The Reichstag was dissolved and a great colonial campaign was conducted throughout the country, which was successful to the extent that the Socialist representation was greatly reduced, although that of the Centre remained steadfast. On the reassembling of the Reichstag the Chancellor made an appeal to the patriotism of the Chamber, and a coalition was formed for carrying on the work of the State. This clumsy expedient only worked satisfactorily so long as controversial legislation was avoided, but the imposition of heavy death duties and increased taxation aroused the opposition of the Conservatives. Prince Bülow resigned, and was succeeded by the present Chancellor, Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg.

From now onwards until the outbreak of the present war, the Pan-German party under its various offshoots, such as the "All-German League", "the Naval Union", and "the Colonial League",¹ gains a distinct ascendancy. The arming of the European nations continues feverishly, and scarcely a year passes without uncomfortable incidents. Since 1896, when the emperor sent a congratulatory telegram to President Kruger on the occasion of his success against the Jameson raid, the relations between Germany and Great Britain have been far from cordial. A wave of Anglophobia burst over the empire, which reached its greatest height at the outbreak of the Boer War. There can be no doubt that this bitter feeling received encouragement from a government keenly desirous of increasing its naval and military strength; for in 1897 and 1900 the naval estimates were enormously high for a nation with peaceable intentions. The most was made of the fact that Germany had been powerless to interfere on behalf of the "down-trodden" Boers because her fleet was not ready.

The Franco-British agreement was signed in 1904, and the Wilhelmstrasse became both anxious and curious as to its scope. It was determined to test its strength, and a chance was found in the German pretensions to a sphere of influence in Morocco. At the instigation of the all-powerful "Pan-German League", at a time when Russia was occupied by her war with Japan, the emperor visited Tangier on 31 March, 1905, and, accompanied by the usual theatrical display, made a highly provocative speech, in which he claimed the rights of Germany in Morocco, together with his intention to maintain the integrity of the sultan's dominions. Backed by Germany the sultan refused the French suggestion for reform, and asked for a conference of the Powers. M. Delcassé, the French Foreign Minister, a diplomat of outstanding ability and the negotiator of the Franco-British agreement, objected to the conference and, in consequence of the bullying methods of the German Foreign Office, was forced to resign. The conference accordingly met on 16 January, 1906, at Algeciras, when an agreement with regard to Moroccan affairs was arrived at. Great Britain lent her support to France throughout the meetings, and the German emperor got

¹ Those interested in this subject should read the Oxford pamphlet, *The Germans: What they Covet*, by C. R. L. Fletcher.
Vol. V

his answer: the "entente" did exist. Henceforth German diplomacy was directed towards the breaking up of the understanding between France and Great Britain; but worse was to come. The position of France and Russia as allies made it necessary for Great Britain, if the understanding with France was to be of practical value, to come to an agreement with Russia by removing points of difference. Accordingly a *modus vivendi* was arranged on 31 August, 1907, by which the integrity of Persia, as well as that of Tibet under the suzerainty of China, was guaranteed by both Powers, while Afghanistan was recognized as a British sphere of influence, although it was to remain inviolate as a buffer state. Thus the strategical strength of the Triple Alliance was balanced by the Triple Entente.

The value of the Triple Entente for the preservation of peace became apparent during the troublesome days of the Young Turk revolution and the Bosnian crisis, when the famous Treaty of Berlin was practically torn up. In contravention of that treaty, and taking advantage of the internal weakness of the Ottoman empire, Bulgaria declared her sovereign independence, and Austria-Hungary formally announced the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Russia protested against the action of Austria-Hungary, and received the support of Great Britain and France, as well as that of Italy, who significantly showed her independence of the Triple Alliance when her own interests were at stake. The annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary, with, of course, the connivance of the German military leaders at the predominance of the Dual Monarchy in the Balkans—which was to be the reward for sharing in the crusade of Pan-Germanism—was held to be a violation of the sanctity of treaties, the necessity for which had been one of the principal clauses of the Treaty of London subsequent to the Black Sea Conference of 1871. Austria-Hungary remained in possession of her booty, though a pecuniary compensation was paid to Turkey and some concessions were allowed to Montenegro. Serbia as the champion of the Balkan Slavs protested; but in turn her protector, Russia, was not in a position to mobilize, and had to bow to the threats of Berlin. Peace was preserved by a straining of national conscience, and inasmuch as treaties from the Teutonic standpoint were obviously only to be observed so long as they were useful, Europe became more and more an armed camp.

The publishing by the *Daily Telegraph* in October, 1908, of an interview granted to its correspondent by the German Emperor caused a great sensation throughout the world. The emperor was in an affable mood and highly indiscreet in his remarks, at least according to German opinion; for he proclaimed his affection for England and his love of peace. The subject of the imperial indiscretion was warmly discussed in the Reichstag, and the imperial Chancellor, Prince Bülow, had to promise on his master's behalf better and more constitutional behaviour in the future.¹ From that moment the emperor was completely in the toils of the military party, that is to say, the all-powerful Pan-German

¹ C. R. L. Fletcher's *The Germans: What they Covet*. (Oxford Pamphlets.)

League, who followed up their victory by harsher laws against the conquered inhabitants of Alsace, Schleswig-Holstein, and Poland.

German diplomacy in 1911 determined to enquire once more into the stability of the Anglo-French entente, and the Moroccan question was reopened. The excuse afforded was that of a rebel movement which was being quelled by a French expedition. The rebellion was successfully quashed, and the French force remained behind to pacify the country. Suddenly in the early days of July a German warship, the *Panther*, appeared off the closed port of Agadir to protect German property and subjects, but inasmuch as German subjects and property were non-existent the object of the *Panther's* appearance was to create a diplomatic situation; in fact, to see if "the Day" of German militarism had dawned. France was as usual bullied, and a demand was made for the cession of territory in French Congo. Again the German Emperor got his answer. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George, in a memorable speech, with the full consent of the Cabinet, threw down the gauntlet to Germany. It was not taken up: German diplomacy understood that the Entente was still healthy. But apart from the strength of the Entente, the financial position of Germany compelled a peaceable solution. An application for a loan in Berlin for military purposes brought to light the astonishing fact that Germany was living on capital borrowed abroad. The control of German gold was in Paris and London. The military party swallowed its wrath and moderated its demands. A convention was signed on 5 November, and the protectorate of France in Morocco was recognized; but, acting on the well-known Bismarckian motto: "*do ut des*" (I give that thou mayest give), concessions in French Congo were wrung from the French. Needless to say, the result of this diplomatic venture was hailed in Berlin with a characteristic outbreak of the bitterest Anglophobia; it seemed to be getting more and more difficult to find a *casus belli* without appearing as the aggressor.

During the Balkan Wars, 1912-13, Germany's attitude was diplomatically correct under the ægis of the Triple Alliance, although it became obvious that sooner or later trouble must arise between the Slav aspirations of Serbia, under the tutelage of Russia, and Austria-Hungary, —which controls the destinies of a large Slav population—the second partner of the Triple Alliance. The war was localized chiefly through Anglo-French diplomacy, and possibly because the bad blood in the Balkans had to be spilled to clear the stage for the larger event that had to be. The veto of Austria to the aspirations of Serbia and Montenegro robbed the Treaty of Bucharest of any permanent value, while the creation of a kingdom of Albania was but an expedient to assuage the Dalmatian jealousies of Austria-Hungary and Italy.

On 28 June, 1914, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir-presumptive to the throne of Austria-Hungary, and his morganatic wife, the Duchess of Hohenberg, while on a State visit to Serajevo, the capital of Bosnia, were assassinated by a Serb. Investigations brought to light a Serbian conspiracy in Belgrade, and in Vienna the view was taken

that the Serbian Government had connived at the assassination. An ultimatum was dispatched to Belgrade couched in such severe terms, and imposing instructions for the quashing of the anti-Austrian propaganda of so insolent a nature, that the national honour of Serbia became involved. No reply was forthcoming to the ultimatum, and accordingly Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. From that moment a general European conflagration was certain. Russia immediately took up the cudgels on behalf of Serbia, seeing in the Austrian ultimatum the handiwork of Germany, and mobilized her army on 29 July. The British Foreign Minister, Sir Edward Grey, endeavoured to obtain German co-operation in the cause of peace, but his efforts were in vain, and it was obvious that Germany meant to have war. It is melancholy to reflect that war might have been averted at the eleventh hour if Austria had exercised more diplomatic patience, and had been in less hurry to attack little Serbia. The efforts of the British ambassadors at Petrograd and Berlin were in vain. Germany mobilized, and France and Russia followed suit: the formal declarations of war were only a matter of a few days. Great Britain still hoped to keep out of the struggle. She asked for a declaration of German respect for Belgian neutrality, which had been guaranteed by all the Powers. The German Chancellor, Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, with amazing cynicism refused to sacrifice German interests to the sentimental obligations of "a scrap of paper". The German hordes invaded Belgium, and met with an unexpected resistance from the gallant Belgian army at Liège, the military splendour of which will not fade through the ages. The Pan-German League has obtained its way: "The Day" has dawned, but what of the morrow?

We have dismissed the diplomatic negotiations which preceded the outbreak of the world war in a few words, because an opportunity will be afforded later of examining in more detail the causes that were at work. But there is always a domestic as well as a diplomatic reason at the roots of the causes of all great wars, and the recent state of German finance is significant. In the days of Bismarck the debt of the empire was but a few millions of marks; in 1905 the expenditure for purely federal matters had reached the enormous sum of £121,000,000, and in 1908 the budget showed a deficit of £4,000,000. "The financial crisis, such as it is, has only been staved off so long by systematically transferring large items of expenditure from the ordinary to the extraordinary estimates and carrying them over."¹ Thus it is evident that in the feverish rivalry of armament Germany had overstepped the mark; she had reached two alternatives—either to create further sources of revenue by imposing an elaborate direct taxation on the federal states of the empire, which would be tantamount to a remodelling of the constitution and an infringement of the sovereignty of the independent states; or else for the financial advisers of the realm to back the confidence of the general staff in the overwhelming superiority of the existing military resources to produce a speedy and

¹ W. H. Dawson's *The Evolution of Modern Germany*.

overwhelming victory. In other words Pan-Germanism must seize its hour, for the morrow might mean bankruptcy or the party's retirement in favour of a democratic policy of retrenchment and reform.

CHAPTER XII

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

It is now time to turn to the history of the Dual Monarchy, the German-Magyar partners in the venture of Pan-Germanism. The crushing defeat of Sadowa in 1866 and the Treaty of Prague threw Austria out of Germany and transferred the hegemony she had enjoyed for centuries to Prussia. She had already lost her Italian possessions, and the last vestige of her sway in the west had vanished; there now only remained the hope of expansion in the east. The immediate result of the war with Germany was that the claims of Hungarian independence could no longer be gainsaid. The Germans of Austria, cut off from the rest of their race, were forced to lean on the Magyars by a common tie—fear of the force of Slavism.

Previous to the war with Prussia in 1866, the first constitutional assembly of the various parts of the Austrian dominions had been summoned as a whole. But the work of the assembly met with great opposition from the Hungarian members desirous of the restoration of the ancient constitution of Hungary, and they obtained the support of the Austrian and Bohemian Conservatives. Accordingly constitutions were restored to the kingdoms of Hungary, Croatia, Slavonia, and Transylvania, and the new Reichsrath was divided into an Upper and Lower House. The Hungarians, however, held aloof from the deliberations of the Chamber, and instituted a passive resistance to the payment of taxes which had to be overcome by a display of military force. This unhappy state of affairs continued until 1865, when a better understanding with the Magyars was arrived at by a speech of the emperor on the summoning of the Hungarian Diet at Budapest, in which he recognized the principle of self-government for Hungary so long as it did not affect the unity of the empire. In other words, Francis Joseph was prepared to consider the question of Dualism.

After the defeat of Sadowa, Hungary was able strictly to enforce the terms she had demanded before the war. The compromise, or *Ausgleich*, made between Austria and Hungary provided that the Austro-Hungarian monarchy should consist of two states, the empire of Austria and the kingdom of Hungary, and that each state should be entirely independent under the same dynasty, but as far as intercourse with the outside world was concerned, such as foreign affairs and defence, they were to be a united country; moreover, the common ministers were to be responsible to the *Delegations*, a body selected from the parliaments of either country. There was some trouble over the

financial arrangements between the two monarchies, as the German Austrians considered that the Hungarians had been assessed too lightly, while the Czechs or Bohemians grumbled because they saw little political benefit to themselves.

The first Chancellor of the Dual Monarchy was Count Beust, a bitter enemy of Prussia, and for the four years in which he held office the relations between Vienna and Berlin were marked by mutual suspicion. But the success of the Prussian arms in the war with France made a hope of reassertion of Austrian dominance in German politics an absolute impossibility. Francis Joseph bowed to the inevitable, and on the retirement of Beust in 1871 appointed as Chancellor the Hungarian, Count Andrassy, who was a *persona grata* with Bismarck. A good understanding was cemented by the meeting of the three emperors in Berlin in 1872, and Prussia acquiesced in Austro-Hungarian aspirations in the Near East.

In both countries the quarrels of the different nationalities have been a great source of weakness to the government. In Austria the worst opposition came from the Czechs in Bohemia, who outnumbered the Germans and desired the restoration of the ancient kingdom of Bohemia, while in the south the Italian-speaking subjects of Austria raised the cry of irredentism.¹ In Hungary the Magyar language had been established, but the Magyars were in reality barely in the ascendancy, and, as in Austria, there was a large Slav population discontented with the inferiority of its position. The Serbs were the most numerous of the Slavonic peoples, so it was the "settled policy of the Magyars to sow discord between the Serbs and the Croats".² There arose a Pan-Serb propaganda in close touch with Belgrade, that has always been an irritating factor for Austro-Hungarian policy in the Near East. Count Taaffe, who became Minister-President of the Austrian Parliament in 1879, and who was a personal friend of the emperor, mollified the Czechs by forming a ministry of all races, which was further increased by the founding of a Czech university at Prague. But the German and Czech element were too frequently at loggerheads in the assembly, and the racial animosities often made parliamentary government difficult to carry on.

The Eastern Question of 1875 affected the Dual Monarchy in opposite ways. The Slavonic races sympathized with the persecuted Christians, while Hungary leant towards the Turks. During the Russo-Turkish war, 1877, Austria-Hungary came to a secret understanding with Russia; but the rapid advance of the Russians to Constantinople caused Andrassy alarm, threw him on to the British side in the demand for a conference of the Powers to discuss the terms of the Peace of San Stefano, and caused him to mobilize the forces on a small scale. The result to the Dual Monarchy of the Congress

¹ Irredentism, from *Italia irredenta* (unredeemed Italy). A term used to convey the desire of Italy to absorb in her union all the outstanding Italian-speaking peoples, chiefly those of the Trentino and Trieste, but even to ultra-patriots Malta, Corsica, and certain of the Dalmatian districts.

² Seton Watson's *Racial Problems in Hungary*.

of Berlin was the mandate to occupy the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which, from the point of view of the Central Powers, as well as of Great Britain, could not be left to Russia. The Austrians had some trouble in effecting the occupation, but in 1879 their sway was formally recognized by the Porte. Further, the Austrians were allowed to garrison the important strategic point of the Sanjak of Novi-Bazar.

The settlement of the Congress of Berlin had sorely mortified Russia, and, as we have seen, Bismarck was forced to make the choice of an alliance with Austria-Hungary; accordingly in 1879 a treaty was concluded with Andrassy. The alliance was regarded as a great triumph for the Austrian Germans, and was the beginning of a Pan-Germanic movement as a safeguard to the menace of Slavism, which at the time had to be discountenanced by the Governments of both empires. The alliance was, of course, welcomed by the Magyars, threatened from the same source; but Hungary, jealous of her independence, was not prepared to go to the same length as Austria.


From 1879 to 1893 the direction of purely Austrian affairs came under Count Taaffe, who, as a personal friend of the emperor, was anxious to be more the minister of the Crown than the State; consequently he used every party indiscriminately, although he had entered the Ministry as a German Liberal, when he saw that it was to his advantage to do so. He was a strict constitutionalist, but no parliamentarian, and endeavoured to use the racial jealousies for the centralization of the executive. His efforts enabled the Czechs to return to parliamentary life, and he refused to countenance German Anti-Slavism. In the main he relied upon the support of the Czechs, the Poles, and the Clericals. The focus of Austrian politics may be said to be Bohemia, where the party of young Czechs gained the ascendancy, with the result that in 1891 they captured every seat in the Bohemian Diet. To counteract this, Taaffe proposed an electoral reform that practically amounted to universal suffrage; but he failed, and retired from office in 1893. This question of electoral reform was before the country for the next three years, and in 1896 a coalition government under Count Badeni carried a Reform Bill by which a fifth curia of voters was added, in which all Austrian subjects above twenty-four years of age were included. This was, however, only a half-developed scheme, and merely added to the general parliamentary confusion between the Czech and German elements. Badeni attempted to govern by passing a language ordinance which made both German and Czech compulsory for officials in Bohemia, but parliamentary obstruction compelled him to resign. The emperor, Francis Joseph, made an effort to improve the political position by calling Körber to power. Körber introduced a strong railway and canalization programme which was popular with all parties, but the same obstruction again occurred on the language problem and the confusion became worse, so that, owing to court pressure, he was forced to resign in 1904. He was succeeded by Count Gautsch, who was compelled by popular clamour to bring in universal suffrage, with the abolition of the five classes. The

new reform proved successful and smoothed the working of Parliament; obstruction had practically ceased, and national jealousies proceeded on more amenable lines under the ægis of democracy.

The weakness in the working of the Austrian constitution—for the granting a constitution was one of the conditions of the *Ausgleich*—added to the power of Hungary, especially in the matter of finance, in the relations between the two nations. By the terms of the *Ausgleich*, economic matters between the two states had to be renewed every ten years, but this period was abolished and arrangements remained until they were revoked. In 1875 Coloman Tisza became Premier of Hungary, and remained in that position for fifteen years. His policy was always directed to strengthening the Magyar dominance in Hungary by the insistence on the teaching of the Magyar language and the suppressing of Slovak pretensions. One of the first reforms of Tisza was directed against the privileges of the Chamber of Magnates; the hereditary rights were abolished, and the payment of a certain fixed sum in land taxes became necessary for a seat; further, the power of the landed nobility was kept in check by the introduction of life members from the other estates. The rule of Tisza was too personal to be healthy for parliamentary institutions; for, although an upright man himself, he practically bribed his followers with the loaves and fishes of office. His fall in 1890 was a relief to patriotic Hungarians.

Under the premiership of Wekerle (1892) the vexed dispute over civil marriages raged. Mixed marriages between Catholics and Protestants were frequent—for the Lutherans are strong among the Slovaks—and the custom, according to the law of 1868, was to baptize children of mixed marriages in the religion of the parent whose sex they inherited, but the practice, owing to the predominance of Catholic authority, was to baptize all children of such marriages as Catholics; consequently Wekerle determined to bring in a Bill to enforce compulsory civil marriage and take the civil registration from the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities. The Bill passed the Lower House, but was thrown out by the Magnates. Wekerle asked the emperor to create fresh peers, but meeting with a refusal, resigned. It was, however, found impossible to get together a new administration, and he was recalled. The Bill became law, and the ascendancy of the Lower House was complete; further, it was a triumph for the Magyars against the Clericals, whose policy was distinctly anti-Magyar.

As Hungary became stronger she demanded a greater measure of independence; with increased strength she was enabled to obtain greater concessions from the Court, and a larger management in the foreign affairs of the Dual Monarchy. The Triple Alliance was not popular with the Austrians, but suited Hungarian policy. The management of the affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1882 was handed over to the Hungarian Kallay, who undoubtedly administered the provinces well. But the Austrians were jealous of the practical annexation of Bosnia by Hungary, which in past ages had held that country under its dominion; and they grumbled at having to pay, by the financial adjustments



NAWAB SALAF JUNG BAHADUR.

FRANCIS JOSEPH I

Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary

From the painting by L. Horowitz in His Majesty's private collection

of the *Ausgleich*, two-thirds of the cost of an administration of which they practically possessed no control. Sure of themselves the Hungarians now began to claim a national army, and in 1889 the army was described as "Imperial and Royal". The Austrians began to question the advantages of Dualism. In 1897 the economic arrangements of the *Ausgleich* had to be renewed, and the situation was fraught with difficulties. The Germans obstructed in the Austrian Parliament, and nothing was accomplished throughout the year 1897. In January, 1898, the *Ausgleich* was renewed until the following May, when the storm broke out again, to find some relief in the general horror felt by both kingdoms at the assassination of the Empress Elizabeth at Geneva by an anarchist in September. Unable to effect an arrangement, the Premier, Count Banffy, resigned in 1899, and was succeeded by Koloman Szell, who managed to carry the *Ausgleich* by effecting a compromise with the various parties and renewing the compact until 1907. Further, as a leader of the Liberals he established a coalition with the national party.

Szell resigned on the military question, and, after the six months' presidency of Count Khuen Hedevary, was succeeded by Count Stephen Tisza. The emperor granted Tisza important military concessions, but he was unpopular with the Clericals, and the Independents fell in an attempt to alter the rules of the Lower House. The Independents triumphed, but they failed in an effort to obtain further military concessions from the king, and General Fejevary took office. The new minister was a favourite of the Court, and had to meet with the full fury of the opposition. To divert attention Kristoffy proposed a Government measure for universal suffrage in Hungary, to throw open politics to the working classes, and divert attention from national jealousies by making the weight of power between the Magyars and non-Magyars less disproportionate. The Fejevary ministry was unable to accomplish its will, and gave place to a coalition cabinet under Wekerle, in which portfolios were given to Louis Kossuth, son of the patriot, Count Apponyi, and Count Andrassy. The new Government was successful in restoring constitutional methods and held together until 1910, in spite of the extreme discontent of the Croats. The electoral reform made the renewal of the economic agreement of the *Ausgleich* possible in 1907 on terms that left no feeling of bitterness on the part of the Austrians.

The history of the Dual Monarchy since 1867 has been essentially of a domestic character; possessing no colonies, the development of the kingdoms lay towards the East, and their foreign policy is identified with that of Germany, with whom they entered into alliance in 1879, afterwards extending the understanding to the Triple Alliance in 1882. By the Treaty of Berlin the occupation, but not the annexation, of Bosnia-Herzegovina was vested in Austria-Hungary.

In 1906 Count Aehrenthal became Foreign Minister, and, zealous to restore Austrian prestige in Europe, embarked on a forward policy in the Balkans, with a view to humiliating Russia. Taking advantage of the Young Turk revolution of July, 1908, and cynically tearing up the Treaty

of Berlin, he suddenly electrified Europe by reopening the Eastern Question and formally annexing to the Hapsburg Crown Bosnia and Herzegovina. Russia was furious at this diplomatic treachery, for she had only recently signed an agreement at Münzberg by which she and Austria agreed jointly to supervise reforms in Macedonia; in other words, they had pooled their Balkan interests. The step taken by the Foreign Minister was inimical to Austrian interests, as it transferred the affections of the peninsula, if one may use such a word in the situation, to Russia. Serbia and Montenegro clamoured for war, and the forces of Pan-Slavism took a determined stand. War between Russia and Austria seemed inevitable, when the Emperor William intervened at Petrograd. Russia was ruefully forced to recognize the fact that she had not sufficiently recovered from the Manchurian campaign to risk fresh hostilities, and was forced for the time to desert her Slav protégés. But the Eastern Question had been reopened with a vengeance. Russia prepared herself for the fray which she knew to be inevitable, and the Balkan League was formed to the detriment of Pan-German schemes in the Near East. At the end of the Balkan War Austria saw her interests threatened on all sides. The path to the Ægean was closed, for a greater Serbia had arisen. Consequently the aim of Austrian diplomacy during the peace negotiations was to prevent Serbia from reaching the sea. The buffer and burlesque State of Albania was the result; but Austria perceived that that expedient was only diplomatic marking time for the event that had to be. The antipathy between Slav and Teuton became more pronounced. The tragedy of Serajevo caused Austrian and Hungarian hatred of the Serb to blaze forth, and the Pan-German excuse for the world war was found.

In concluding this section it may prove useful to say a few words about the cult of Pan-Germanism in Austria. The movement was later in making its appearance than in Prussia, and was first voiced by Herr Schönerer in 1878 as the desire of the Austrian Germans for a closer union with the German Empire. He was well snubbed by Bismarck, who feared Austrian Catholicism. But the foundation of the Pan-German League in 1894 by Herr Hasse, of Leipzig, gave a tremendous impetus to the movement. In 1901 "in Austria-Hungary alone there were eighty-five centres, a large section of the press was under its control, and twenty members of the Austrian Parliament were its devoted adherents".¹

Schönerer's party used the pretext of the Language Ordinances, introduced by Count Badeni in 1897, to start a great agitation; a mass meeting was held at Dresden, and their efforts were successful in causing the withdrawal of the Ordinances. In 1899 the Pan-Germans started the "*Los von Rom!*" ('away from Rome') movement" in the interest of Protestantism; in other words the Pan-Germans had become separatists, while the various economic troubles and riots that occurred through Austria in that year can be traced to this organization. There are evidences, too, of dissension in the army sown by the Pan-German

¹ Geoffrey Drage's *Austria-Hungary*, p. 537.

antagonism to the Slav. In 1906 Stein openly declared in Parliament the desire of the Pan-Germans for union under the house of Hohenzollern.

Undoubtedly there has been a great movement in Germany and Austria for union, which has given alarm to leading thought in Austria, loyal to the hopes of the Dual Monarchy. The opinion was openly voiced at a great meeting held in Berlin in 1906 under the leadership of Herr Class, who threw down the gauntlet to Pan-Slavism. The German Emperor himself did not hesitate to back the movement even when in Austrian territory, and in 1900 on two occasions said as much as diplomatic discretion would permit. In commercial circles, especially in Bohemia, the movement has many adherents. In Hungary the aims of Pan-Germanism are watched with evident jealousy; but the Magyar tolerates German aggression as a lesser evil than Pan-Slavism.

PART III

Pan-Slavism

CHAPTER XIII

RUSSIA

In dealing with German affairs we have seen that the mainspring of German *welt-politik* is Pan-Germanism, or the political desire that everything German shall be unified under Hohenzollern leadership, shall burst its European boundaries, and dominate the world. That is one dream; the other dream is that of the Slav populations of South-Eastern Europe who, oppressed by German rule or opposition, seek a racial unity under the cry of Pan-Slavism, and look to Russia and the house of Romanoff for their deliverance. Pan-Germanic and Pan-Slavonic intrigue have dominated Continental policy for the last thirty years. The Treaty of Berlin, presided over by the robust genius of Bismarck and the fascinating personality of Lord Beaconsfield, ended in a triumph for German diplomacy and let loose the force of Pan-Slavism. But Bismarck had forgotten the two mourning provinces, Alsace and Lorraine; they cried out as much against Pan-Germanism as oppressed Poles and Serbs, and when his "honest brokering" drove him into the Austrian alliance the Franco-Russian understanding became but a question of time.

Pan-Slavism is an old creed, and dates from the time of Peter the Great. It was probably first promulgated by the Austrian patriot, Krijanitch, who looked to Russia as the saviour of Slavdom, and was the founder of the literary cult of the movement. During the eighteenth century Russia incessantly intrigued in Austria to gain ascendancy among the Slavs; but it was not until the nineteenth century was well advanced that the Pan-Slav movement really received political impetus, when the writings of Kollar and Sharfarjik began to influence Slav thought. Kollar's masterpiece, *The Daughter of Slava*, inspired the scattered Slavs with the hope of ridding themselves of their German masters. In Russia the movement was fostered by the Moscow Slavophiles, who desired a triumphant Russia from the Adriatic to the Pacific. The chief source of Slav culture was Czech, which has recently become national, that is to say Bohemian, in its views, although offering a broad sympathy to the whole Slav cause. During

the course of last century several successful Slav congresses were held, notably at Prague in 1848, and Moscow in 1867, where, out of fear of the recent German awakening, Pan-Slavism embraced a more forward policy. Since the opening of this century the most important Slavonic event has been the visit of Dr. Kromarsch, the Czech leader, to Petrograd in 1908, and the Congress at Prague in the same year. At this Congress representatives were present from every Slav state, and, although nominally interested in a cultural propaganda, Pan-Slavism was to provide a bulwark against German expansion in the Near East, and was to be an embodied hatred of Germany.¹

Since 1870 the Balkan nations have see-sawed between a Russophil and a Germanophil policy, and if Russia received set-backs in what is naturally her sphere of influence, it must be attributed to the fault of her bureaucratic rule—itself inspired by German intrigue—which occasionally alienated the affections of the peoples whose cause she had valiantly upheld, notably in the case of Bulgaria. For the sake of convenience we propose to group all the Balkan kingdoms in the Pan-Slavonic classification, though, of course, strictly speaking, Greece and Rumania are not Slav states, but their interests are mainly anti-German, just as the interests of the Magyar State of Hungary are bound up in the politics of Pan-Germanism.

After the Crimean War, Russian policy in the west received a check, and domestic policy claimed her attention. The reactionary policy of Nicholas I had obviously failed, and his son, Alexander II, who succeeded him, at the beginning of his reign inclined to a Liberal outlook. His first great measure was the liberation of the serfs, which was carried at the cost of great personal sacrifice, and was opposed to the interests of the privileged classes. In 1864 the emperor's next measure of reform was the establishment of the *zemstvos*, or county councils, to which all classes were eligible, and trial by jury, the efficacy of which law was hampered by the establishment of a special procedure for political cases. But after an attempt had been made by Karakozoff, of the Nihilist creed, on the emperor's life (15 April, 1866), the imperial policy once more became absolutist and reactionary.

This cult of Nihilism arose in the early years of Alexander II's reign, and its originator was a certain Russian landlord of considerable wealth named Bakunin, who had absorbed the German philosophy of Hegel and the French notions of Prudhon. The movement was further helped by the writings of the Russian author, Turgenieff, and, at first merely literary in its character, was concerned, along with Slavophil societies, in the regeneration of the Russian race. From being the creed, or, it may almost be said, the pose of a few earnest and perhaps eccentric young men and women, it developed, under the fiery incentive of Bakunin, into a highly dangerous and subversive political organization; for, despairing of exposing the abuses of bureaucracy by the power of the pen, a vigorous policy of force was resorted to. The chief tenet

¹ Geoffrey Drage's *Austria-Hungary*, p. 557.



ALEXANDER II, TSAR OF RUSSIA



ALEXANDER III, TSAR OF RUSSIA

NA WAE SALAH JUNG BAHADUR



CONSTANTINE PETROVITCH
POBYEDONOSTEFF



COUNT WITTE

From a photograph by Levitsky

of Nihilism, apart from its glorification of the individual, is that "all property is theft", which statement is very little removed from anarchy. A violent propaganda was conducted among the recently emancipated and ignorant serfs, who were dissatisfied with the results of the recent changes.

Indignation at the corruption of the officials during the war with Turkey (1877-8) lent an impetus to the cause. A central executive of the Nihilists was formed, and a series of successful attacks on the more hated officials was organized. Among the chief outrages were the assassination of a chief of the police at Petrograd (1878), the governor of Kharkof (1879), and the explosion at the Winter Palace (1880), when the emperor narrowly escaped destruction. Alexander II's answer to this attempt was to rescind privileges he had granted, and to confer extraordinary powers on a special commission under General Loris Melikoff, a good organizer and a man of liberal views. Melikoff was averse to giving way to threats in the matter of establishing a national assembly, but he had no belief in the harsh methods of officialdom. He saw the necessity for granting reforms and a larger participation in the government by the responsible classes. The general strongly urged the emperor to strengthen the Council of State by the addition of delegates from the nobility and principal towns and provinces. Alexander II hesitated for a few days before giving his consent to the scheme, which had already been approved by the council. But on the very morning on which the imperial ukase was to be published announcing the change, he was assassinated by a Nihilist on his return from a military parade. When the news of the emperor's intentions became public there was a great revulsion of public feeling, and indignation and sorrow for the tragic fate of their benefactor. From that day the force of Nihilism was spent. Right-minded people regarded its adherents as murderers, and the progressive politicians saw in them the ruin of their cause. By the end of the century the movement had become a negligible quantity. The foreign policy of Alexander II was directed to the consolidating of his influence in the Balkans, and the undoing of the effects of the unfortunate campaign in the Crimea. During the Franco-Prussian War Russia maintained strict neutrality; but, in order to divert her attention from the west, Bismarck, as we have seen, urged the Russian Chancellor to open the question of the Black Sea Clause of the Treaty of Paris. This cynical rejection of a treaty caused considerable friction with Great Britain, and the relations between the two countries became strained. A settlement was arrived at by the Congress and Treaty of London, which proved a diplomatic victory for Gortschakoff. But the most important event of Alexander II's reign was the acute European crisis of 1875, resulting in the war with Turkey, and the subsequent Congress and Treaty of Berlin. The subject of this Eastern Question has been dealt with in a former section; so it now concerns us to follow the course of the war itself.

The immediate causes of the war were the revolutions in Bosnia

and Herzegovina, in the quelling of which the Turks showed great severity, to be followed by unspeakable atrocities on the Bulgarians, who also had asserted their independence. The failure of satisfactory assurances from the Porte at the conference of the Powers at Constantinople left Russia no other course but to declare war, and the justice of her cause was recognized in the neutrality of the other Powers. Before beginning hostilities Russia signed a convention with the Prince of Rumania by which the Russian troops were permitted to pass through Rumanian territory, the emperor pledging himself to maintain the integrity of his kingdom. At the same time, the prince took the opportunity of repudiating the suzerainty of the sultan. Unfortunately, at the outset there was a hitch in the understanding, the Prince of Rumania refusing to co-operate with his troops if they were to be placed under the Russian commander-in-chief.

Owing to the lack of a preponderant navy the Russians were bound, after passing through Rumania, to cross the Danube and pierce the Balkan passes. The Danube was in flood and detrimental delay occurred, extreme difficulties being experienced in effecting a passage; but eventually this was safely accomplished on 22 June, and the Russian troops passed into the Dobrudja in Bulgarian territory. General Gurko quickly pressed forward, took Tirnova, and by a brilliant march crossed the Balkans by the little-used Pass of Khain Koi, and occupied the important Shipka Pass in the rear. Adrianople was threatened, and something like a panic spread through the Turkish army. The sultan dismissed his war minister, and the Turkish commander, Abdul Kerim, was deposed. Mehmed Ali, a German, was placed in supreme command, and Suleiman Pasha was recalled from the operations against the Montenegrins for the defence of Roumelia. The Turkish cause looked desperate, and Alexander II was already throwing out hints to the military attachés of the Powers as to the terms of peace he would impose, when suddenly the fortunes of the Turks were changed by the deeds of Osman Pasha.

In order to save the town of Nicopolis, a strategic centre of the first importance, Osman hurried over from Widdhi and entrenched himself at Plevna. Unaware of his presence there, General Krüdner attacked with an inferior force, and retired with a loss of 3000 men. A second attack under Krüdner and Schapofski proved more disastrous than the first, resulting in a loss of 7336 killed and wounded. The Russian position was distinctly uncomfortable, for their communications in the Balkans were threatened, as Suleiman Pasha was creeping round from Adrianople. Part of Gurko's army met with a reverse at Eski-Zagra, and beat a retreat over the Khain Koi Pass. But Osman Pasha, for some unaccountable reason refusing to press his advantage, allowed General Krüdner to withdraw his forces towards Sistova, and Suleiman Pasha remained inactive in the Balkans. Towards the middle of August heavy Russian reinforcements began to arrive, and the Turkish opportunity of snatching victory was over. Meanwhile the

GENERAL SKOBELEFF AT THE SHIPKA PASS. From a painting by Vassili Verestschagin.

The Shipka Pass, one of the passes across the Balkans in Bulgaria, figured prominently in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. It carries the road south from Tirnovo to Eski-Sagra and Adrianople. The Russians captured it on 19th July, 1877, and held it throughout the rest of the war. On 9th January, 1878, the Russians captured a large Turkish force at the foot of the pass by a combined attack in front and on both flanks. The frontal attack was made by Radetzky, and the flank attacks by the famous General Skobelev and Prince Mirsky. The two latter commanders had previously crossed the Balkan range, the former to the west and the latter to the east of the Shipka Pass, both in deep snow. Skobelev's route was a particularly difficult one.

The painter, Vassili Verestschagin, was born in 1842, and perished in the sinking of the Russian flagship *Petropavlovsk* in 1904, during the Russo-Japanese War. He served with the Russian army during the Russo-Turkish War, and painted several pictures of its scenes and incidents.



GENERAL SKOBELEFF AT THE SHIPKA PASS

VASSILI VERESTSCHAGIN



squabble as to etiquette with the Rumanian command was smoothed over, and Prince Charles crossed the Danube at the head of 35,000 Rumanians. On 3 September Skoboleff captured Lovtcha, between the Balkans and Plevna, with a loss to the Turks of 15,000 men, and the attack on Plevna consequently became easier.

A general attack was ordered on 11 September, and the Grivitsa redoubt was carried by the Rumanians; but the attack on a second redoubt failed. The Russians then resorted to the method of starving out Osman Pasha, and a close investment of Plevna took place. Osman's supplies failed, and after a desperate sortie on 10 December, 1877, he surrendered with the remnant of his army. With the fall of Plevna the war was practically over. Suleiman Pasha failed to hold the Russians at the Shipka Pass, and the important fortress of Kars in Asia Minor fell to their arms. The Turks were further routed by the Montenegrins, while their difficulties were added to by the appearance of Serbia in the arena.

Gurko, after passing through the Balkans, seized Sofia and defeated Suleiman near Philippopolis, while Skoboleff and Radetzky surrounded the Turkish army at Shejnovovo near the Shipka Pass, and on 9 January, 1878, the Russians entered Adrianople. The Serbians were equally victorious, and defeated the Turks at Nish and Vrania. The Russian lines now approached Constantinople, and the Powers began to take alarm, while the British fleet was ordered to Besika Bay. The confusion was further added to by the sudden participation of the Greeks in the fray. A Greek force invaded Thessaly, February, 1878, but was forced to withdraw at the order of the Powers, who promised to remember Greek claims when peace should be declared. Meanwhile Russia had concluded peace with the Turks at San Stefano, and the discussion of the terms was transferred to the Congress held at Berlin, June, 1878, the story of which has already been told. It remains to be noted that Russia behaved with great ingratitude to Rumania by demanding the cession of Bessarabia in exchange for the district of the Dobrudja. Prince Charles fulminated against this aggression, but in vain. It took some time before Rumania forgave Russia for this disservice. But, apart from the discontent expressed by some of the smaller nationalities at the result of the Treaty of Berlin, it was nothing to the humiliation felt by Russia, who saw herself ousted from Western Europe, and Germany supreme on the Continent.

The first instincts of Alexander III on ascending the throne were to give effect to the ukase for a consultative assembly of notables which his father had just signed; but under the baleful influence of Pobye-donosteff, the ecclesiastical procurator, he soon changed his mind. Pobye-donosteff had been the new emperor's tutor, and had imbued him with the doctrine of orthodoxy and autocracy. To the procurator Holy Russia stood for a mission to the whole world under the wing of the Greek Church, and to him all democratic institutions were anathema. With such a mentor Alexander III entered on a vigorous reactionary

policy and the suppression of the Nihilists with redoubled strength. The Court went into seclusion, and for the rest of his life Alexander waged war with unseen foes, while he never swerved from his autocratic principles. He was a man of herculean proportions, but with the mind of a country squire, though there can be no doubt of his sincere religious convictions.

The Jews were the first to come under the Government's displeasure. It was alleged that they had participated in the Nihilist plot for the assassination of Alexander II, and outrages against the Jews were sadly frequent throughout the empire, especially as such actions met with scant reprobation from those in authority. The worst excesses were committed in the town of Balta, where the pillage of Jewish property was on an unprecedented scale. The Government's actual share in Jew-baiting consisted in measures repressive to Jewish freedom. The native Jews were thrust back to the south and west, while all foreign Jews were ordered to leave the empire, and an extraordinary exodus took place. Further, the Jews could have no share in the *zemstvo* or the benefits of State education, and they were forbidden to own farms and property outside large towns. The cause of orthodoxy was zealously defended and dissenters were persecuted, especially the German Lutheran sect of Little Russia known as the Stundists. This sect appears to have been quiet and inoffensive, but as it was inimical to orthodoxy their communities were broken up, and many of them met their fate by execution or banishment to Siberia. Even the Polish Roman Catholics and the Baltic Lutherans were prosecuted, and under the sway of Alexander III, who held that orthodoxy and nationality were synonymous terms, the Greek Church received an enormous augmentation of its power. It was during this period that the writings of Tolstoy began to be a force.

During the years 1891-3 there was great trade depression throughout Russia, with consequent labour unrest and unemployment. Strikes were frequent throughout the largest towns of the country, and famine threatened everywhere. The Finance Minister, Bunge, was called in to deal with the crisis, caused by the springing into being of a new industrial class. Bunge directed his attention to the evils of child labour, which he regulated, and in 1886 he produced a Factory Act, in which the relations of masters and men were better defined; but the law was too bureaucratic in its working and satisfied neither party, and Bunge retired. His successor, Vishnegradsky, practically legislated for the employer.

From 1887 Russian trade received an enormous impetus, and industries sprang up—especially that of cotton—on all sides, which were chiefly under foreign control. The reactionary and paternal style of government of Alexander III was quite unable to cope with such movements.

Unfortunately this period of commercial prosperity was counter-balanced by one of agricultural distress. In 1891-3 there occurred a famine of unparalleled severity, which proved too much for the resources

of the Government, who were forced to call in experts of all kinds—financiers, professional men, and students—to the great gain of the cause of popular freedom.

The foreign policy of Alexander III was marked by considerable changes. His father had adhered to the traditional Romanoff friendship for Germany, which even the effects of the Russian betrayal at the Congress of Berlin did not entirely allay; for a secret understanding took place between Russia and Germany in 1880, known as the Re-insurance. After the murder of his father the new emperor met the old Emperor William at Danzig in 1881, and the Three Emperors' League of Skierniowice, 1884, brought closer relations with Germany for four years. But Alexander III had begun to suspect German motives, which was the natural result of the antipathy to German influence that he had expressed as Czarewitch, and he refused to renew the convention when it lapsed in 1887. To counteract the preponderance of the Triple Alliance he looked towards France.

A French alliance was not immediately possible, but it was helped by such events as the visit of the French fleet to Kronstadt in 1891, where the French received a great popular ovation. In 1894 the two nations drew sensibly closer, and a military convention was drawn up. The visit of President Felix Faure to Petrograd in 1897 marks the actual first public announcement of the Dual Alliance, which ten years later was to blossom forth in the Triple Entente, although there was nothing in Alexander's reign to presage such an understanding; for the relations between London and Petrograd throughout this period were uniformly bad, the result of that Russian forward policy in Asia which almost ended in hostilities over the Penjneh incident.


Alexander III died at Livadia on 1 November, 1894, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Nicholas II. The new emperor was known to be of an amiable disposition, so the reforming parties throughout the empire had high hopes of a change of policy; but these hopes were at once disappointed. Nicholas had also sat at the feet of the sinister Pobyedonosteff, and had learnt the lessons of absolutism and orthodoxy. To a deputation of several zemstvos under the leadership of the barrister Radicheff, asking to be given some share in the making of laws and in the internal administration of the country, he gave the reply that the things they asked for were "senseless dreams". But if the shadow of Pobyedonosteff reached from the last reign there also came with it that of the brilliant Finance Minister, Witte, who had succeeded the protectionist, Vishnegradsky. Witte set out with great boldness to develop Russian industry. His first reform was to make a fixed value for the rouble, the exchange value of which had suffered from the speculation in paper roubles, especially in Berlin. He established a gold standard rouble, and increased the gold reserve of the empire. Witte then proceeded, for the development of commerce, to establish a vast system of State monopolies. He bought up the private railways, so that whereas in 1889 scarcely a quarter of the railway system was under State control, in 1900 more than 60 per cent of the

railway system belonged to the State, though it must be confessed that the result was not directly profitable. A Government spirit monopoly was then established, which, apart from being an important source of revenue, was intended to prevent the increasing drunkenness by localizing the sale of alcohol. The reform, practically owing to corruption in the executive, has not been successful in its philanthropic object, and at the outbreak of the World War the emperor issued a ukase forbidding the monopoly and the sale of alcohol altogether. Witte proceeded to foster trade by every financial means: foreign loans were negotiated, factories were built with State aid, and assistance was lent to banks. In 1894 a tariff treaty of ten years' value was signed with Germany. But the system of indirect taxation proved a grievous burden for the poor man, who was paying twice as much as his equal in other lands for the necessities of life. The result was that emigration increased, concerning which the emperor caused enquiries to be made, when it was found to be due to the heavy taxation. This emigration found some relief in the opening of the Trans-Siberian Railway, and the special concessions granted to settlers.

Russian statesmen had begun to be alarmed at what was known as "the exhaustion of the centre of the empire", in other words the land was being under-cultivated; the sowing of cereals had become alarmingly less, and—always a bad sign—the planting of potatoes was increasing. The upkeep of cattle had also fallen off. Witte set up a commission to enquire into agricultural conditions, and it was found necessary to ask for the aid of the zemstvos. The result was an enormous increase of public activity, which, though nominally economic in its scope, could not fail to become political. In fact, the quiet work of the commission on the famine of 1891-3 was about to bear fruit. All the committees made some report that was critical of the existing system of government, and some asked frankly for revolutionary measures, such as freedom of the press, parliamentary representation, and legal safeguards of the person. Such a propaganda was naturally repulsive to Pobyedonosteff, and the forces of absolutism were thoroughly alarmed. Witte was felt to be dangerous; he was dismissed, and Plehve, upon whose Ministry of the Interior Witte had tried to cast the blame, practically became dictator; repressive reaction became the order of the day, while a further prosecution of the Jews was connived at by the Government. Shipoff was deposed from the presidency of the Moscow zemstvo, from which position he had ably and quietly marshalled the followers of reform. The ominous growls of the zemstvos could be heard, and all classes joined in a common hatred of Plehve.

The merciless Plehve remained in power until, on the disastrous outbreak of the Japanese war, he fell to the assassin's bomb, being literally blown to pieces outside the Warsaw station in Petrograd, 28 July, 1904.

It is now time to leave Russian domestic affairs and turn to the



THE TSARITSA, ALEXANDRA

From a photograph



NAWAB SALAF JUNG BAHADUR.

NICHOLAS II, TSAR OF RUSSIA

From a photograph by Bonason & Egger

The Tsar is wearing the uniform of a British Admiral

events which led to the disastrous war with Japan. By a treaty concluded with China in 1902 Russia guaranteed Chinese integrity and promised to evacuate Manchuria. Russia was established in the Liaotung Peninsula; but there was an understanding as to the sphere of influence of Japan in Korea, which she must be free to develop without the menace of the Russian presence in Manchuria. The evacuation from the province was supposed to be completed in three periods of six months each, and each evacuated portion was to be restored to China. All went well till it was time for the second evacuation to take place, but on the remonstrance of the Chinese ambassador in Petrograd conditions were made as to concessions in Manchuria which had not formed part of the treaty. Such conditions being refused, the activities of Russian subjects in northern Korea became very marked, especially those of a certain Bezobrazoff on the Yalu and Tumen rivers, where concessions had been obtained from the Korean Government. To protect these concessions on the Yalu, Russian troops were moved up. Japan at once made representations in Petrograd with regard to this violation of her rights, and offered to effect a fresh treaty by which the interests of both countries might be safeguarded. Tedious negotiations followed, during which Russia was obviously strengthening her military position. A further note from Japan, asking for a recognition within a stated time of her sphere of influence in Korea in exchange for a similar undertaking with regard to Russia in Manchuria, elicited no reply from Petrograd, accordingly Japan, to the amazement of Europe, began to mobilize. The temerity of the island power in attacking the mighty Russian empire with its vast resources was more apparent than real, for the difficulties in the way of an effective forward movement of troops to the Far East were enormous. At the outbreak of hostilities the Russian forces in the East, as far as numbers went, may be described as adequate for defensive purposes, and were scattered over an immense area, while reinforcements from Europe could only be hurried along according to the capacity of the Eastern Siberian Railway, the construction of which had been as cheaply performed as possible, with the consequence that it was unsuitable for the heavy military traffic about to be imposed on it. Further, there was the gap in the route formed by Lake Baikal, which had to be crossed, and which after January is frozen; so troops had to march across the ice. Japan had timed her moment well. She was aware of the weakness of the Russian giant, and was able to assume the offensive at once. As far as naval strength was concerned, the position of both countries was fairly equal. Japan wished to strike hard at her enemy before reinforcements could arrive from Europe, and, above all, to establish an ascendancy at sea. She determined to attack Port Arthur; her choice was wise from a strategical point of view, and also as a means of heartening the national conscience, which had never forgiven the forced abandonment of that port in 1895. Besides, it was easier to land troops in western Korea and southern Manchuria. The Japanese plan was to attack the Russian fleet at Port Arthur and Chemulpo,

and force the Korean Government to permit an army to pass through its territory to the Yalu River, thus eventually to invade Manchuria with a view to attacking Port Arthur on the land side. With great secrecy, on 6 February, four battalions were embarked at Sasebo, and under naval escort made for Chemulpo, the main fleet under Admiral Togo meanwhile sailing for Port Arthur. On 8 February the disembarkation, in spite of a scrap with Russian gunboats, was successfully accomplished, and on the following day the Korean capital, Seoul, was occupied. On the same day the efforts of Admiral Togo were crowned with success: the Russian fleet was surprised, and more than half its fighting strength in the Yellow Sea was put out of action. Japanese command of the sea was assured, and the advantage gained was followed up by the land command. Under the protection of the fleet, which successfully repulsed the frequent attack of the Russian ships from Port Arthur, General Kuroki effected the landing of the First Japanese Army in northern Korea (29 March). On 5 April he drove back the Russian outposts and established his forces behind the Yalu.

Meanwhile the supreme command of the Russian forces in the East had been given to General Kuropatkin, who arrived at Liaoyang on 27 March. Recognizing the Japanese command of the sea, Kuropatkin, after garrisoning Port Arthur and Vladivostock, determined to harry Japanese detachments, but to keep on the defensive until he had received sufficient support from Europe. He was, however, overruled by the opposition of Admiral Alexeyeff, the viceroy, who disagreed with his plans. Alexeyeff professed a profound contempt for the yellow races, and underrated the enemy; he pretended to be anxious as to the fate of Port Arthur, and refused to leave the place to its own resources. The viceroy advocated the dispatching of a strong fleet from home, in order to wrest her sea advantage from Japan. But Japan was also to gain the first advantage on land. General Zasulich, with an army of about 20,000 men, arrived on the Yalu on 22 April, and immediately came into touch with General Kuroki. The greater part of the Russian troops were massed about Antung, opposite Wiju, where they were strongly entrenched, and Kuropatkin's orders to Zasulich were to keep a close watch on the enemy without coming into direct conflict with him. Zasulich, however, underrated the quality of the Japanese troops, and relied on the strength of his position. Kuroki kept Zasulich nervous about his right by cleverly feigned attacks, but his real objective was to cross the Yalu above Wiju. On 1 May Kuroki gave battle in a mist; when it lifted, the Russians found their left threatened in force, and within two hours it was driven from its position. The Japanese then occupied the right bank of the river. Zasulich tried to save his left flank by sounding a retreat; but it was too late, for the Japanese right swung round, and the Russian line of retreat was cut off. Zasulich rallied his men and saved a rout; but Kuroki's victory was decisive, the gain of which in *morale* to the Japanese army and nation was enormous, in spite of the fact that it

was largely due to the disobedience of the Russian general. The immediate effect of the victory was to clear the way for the advance on Port Arthur. Togo had meanwhile successfully blocked the mouth of the harbour at Port Arthur, thus preventing the sortie of any large Russian vessels; and with this protection a second army under General Oku, in the face of great difficulties, effected a landing off Howtushih, on the southern Manchurian coast. When Kuropatkin's cavalry, which had been working northward, came into touch with the coast, it was to find Oku in a very unassailable position, and Port Arthur cut off from the outside world. The timely landing of the Japanese tenth division at Takushan under General Kawamura completed the military arrangements, with Kuroki on the right and Oku on the left. The march against the fortress then began.

Kuropatkin had meanwhile ordered General Stoessel, the commandant, to leave Port Arthur while it was yet possible, but Stoessel ignored the order, or pretended that he had never received it. The neck of the Kwantung peninsula at Nanshan was strongly fortified, and Oku's attack was waited for. With some assistance from light craft at sea the Japanese general, on 26 May, began his assault on the Nanshan fortifications. Assault after assault was made with heavy loss, and it was evening before the Japanese succeeded in gaining the victory, the immediate fruit of which was the occupation of the port of Dalny.

A direct advance on Port Arthur now began under the command of General Nogi at the head of the third army, while Oku's forces advanced on Yingkow, Kuroki having occupied Fenghwangch'eng. Kuropatkin, instead of holding two of the Japanese columns and endeavouring to rout the third, found himself with transport difficulties owing to the mountainous nature of the country, and decided to concentrate in the rear at Harbin. Again Alexeyeff interfered, and ordered that Port Arthur should be relieved at all costs. Stackelberg, with 26,000 men, was sent south to draw Oku's attention; but the Russian general, in spite of orders to the contrary, was forced to give battle against superior numbers, and suffered a heavy defeat at Telissu, with 4000 casualties and the loss of sixteen guns.

With difficulty the second Japanese army reached K'aip'ing on 8 July. While, after receiving generous supplies, Kuroki left Fenghwangch'eng and occupied the Motien Pass on 30 June, from which the repeated efforts of Keller were unavailing to dislodge him, a fourth army, under General Count Nodzu, had been formed, and by now three Japanese armies were advancing towards the Liao valley.

In the meantime, important naval actions had been taking place. Four Russian cruisers from Vladivostock had succeeded in evading the Japanese Admiral Kamimura, and, after sinking three Japanese transports with great loss of life, had done considerable damage to merchant shipping. Suddenly, on 23 June, Admiral Witthoft emerged from Port Arthur with a considerable squadron, which proved that the Russians had been able to repair many of their damaged fleet, and

the Japanese maritime supremacy was seriously questioned. However, Witthoft did not take advantage of his opportunity, and on the appearance of Togo retired without offering battle. Togo at once reinstated the blockade.

On 6 July Marshal Oyama arrived at K'ai-p'ing to take over the supreme command of the Japanese armies, which had now converged. Oku, with 53,000 men, attacked Zarubeieff, who had a force of 36,000, on 24 July. But the Russian general fought a retiring action, and Yinkow fell into the hands of the Japanese. Oku was joined on 1 August by Nodzu, and Kuroki was successful in the valley of Lanho against Count Keller, inflicting on him a loss of 2000 killed and wounded. A period of inaction followed, since Kuropatkin refused to take the initiative, which Oku employed in preparing his communications and settling the defence of Yinkow.

Meanwhile Nogi, who had been reinforced, renewed operations against Port Arthur. He had, however, underrated the strength of the Russian fortifications, and it was only by enormous losses and after fighting two days and two nights that he succeeded in turning the Russians. After these costly preliminaries Nogi assaulted the main defences, and at a great sacrifice of life captured two of the outlying eastern forts. Acting under orders from Petrograd, Admiral Witthoft made an attempt to escape with the Russian fleet to Vladivostock. The fleet, however, was unable to avoid joining battle, and was practically destroyed by the superior gunnery of the Japanese. During the engagement the Russian admiral was slain by a stray shot.

The danger from the Russian fleet being over, Nogi again began a general assault with siege artillery, but only gained a small advantage at the immense sacrifice of 15,000 casualties (20 August). The Japanese then continued the siege on more orthodox strategical lines.

In the other sphere of hostilities Oyama determined on an advance against Kuropatkin, who held fortified positions on the left bank of the Taitzu-ho, with his advance guard at Liaoyang. Kuroki was ordered on 24 August to push back the Russians on to their fortified positions. The Japanese general fought valiantly for four days, and, owing to his isolated position, was in some danger of being cut off. Oku and Nodzu were sent to join him, and Oyama began his main attack on 30 August. For two days the fortunes of war wavered, but a successful flanking movement by Kuroki altered the aspect of affairs for the Japanese. Kuroki was now on the north of the Tsaitzu-ho, and Kuropatkin launched a counter-attack which failed, one Russian brigade being almost annihilated. Kuropatkin now ordered a retreat, which was accomplished in good order, Oyama remaining victor at a desperate cost that left him too exhausted to pursue his advantage.

The Russian commander-in-chief retired on Mukden, where he was heavily reinforced from Europe, while Oyama brought his regiments up to their full strength. The Russian army now consisted of about 220,000 men, that of Japan being computed at 160,000. Kuropatkin on 2 October took the initiative, his plan being to overwhelm the



ADMIRAL ALEXEYEFF



GENERAL KUROPATKIN

From photographs by Levitsky, Petrograd

NAWAE GALAT JUNG TAKAKURA.



MARSHAL OYAMA

From a photograph by Underwood & Underwood



ADMIRAL TOGO

From a photograph by the H. C. White Co.

LEADERS IN THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR (1904-5)

Japanese right under Kuroki, Stackelberg being entrusted with this operation, while Bilderling was to advance against the second and fourth armies. Bilderling's movements in a mountainous country were slow, and Stackelberg was unable to assume the offensive till 10 October. Oyama then attacked vigorously on the left, forced back Bilderling, and, with Kuroki's assistance, defeated the Fourth Siberian Corps, jeopardizing Stackelberg's line of retreat, who was forced to act on the defensive. There followed fierce fighting on the Sha-ho for the possession of the village and hill of Sha-ho-pu. This height, after being twice captured and recaptured, fell on 15 October to the Japanese, only to be retaken next day by Putiloff, and, although the village again fell to the Japanese, they were unable to dislodge the Russians. Both armies were by now exhausted, and the battle was left undecided, the losses on both sides being enormous.

During the middle of October the long-delayed Baltic fleet sailed from the Neva under the command of Admiral Rozhdestvensky, and on its voyage there occurred the unpleasant episode of the Dogger Bank, when several Hull fishing smacks were fired upon, resulting in the loss of life. The British Government kept its head, and an international crisis was weathered. The affair was subsequently settled by a special commission of arbitration in Paris, when Great Britain was awarded adequate compensation. The news of the sailing of the Baltic fleet reached Port Arthur, and Nogi redoubled his exertions against the fortress after being heavily reinforced. Assaults on the eastern fortress having failed, attention was directed to the north-west front, dominated by 203 Metre Hill, and on 5 December the hill fell to the Japanese arms at a cost of 13,000 men. From this important position commanding the harbour Nogi resumed his attack on the western forts. Meanwhile two eastern forts fell on 18 and 20 November respectively, and the Russian position was further undermined by the dissension of the generals.

Suddenly, on 1 January, 1905, General Stoessel, without the knowledge of his colleagues, capitulated, and the Japanese became masters of Port Arthur, although it became very evident on occupation that the Russians were by no means at the end of their resources. In fact, Stoessel's surrender will remain for all time one of the mysteries of modern warfare, ranking with Bazaine's surrender of Metz in 1871.

Fearing the access of strength to the enemy from the liberated battalions of Port Arthur, Kuropatkin determined to press forward. By reinforcements his army had reached 250,000 men, and his initiative had been bettered by the recall of Alexeyeff. Accordingly, on 8 January, he dispatched General Mischenko with 6000 Cossack cavalry to harry the Japanese communications. But the enemy was on the alert, and Mischenko was forced to return after accomplishing very little. A more extensive effort was then made under Gripenberg on 24 January, who, after taking Hokutai and fighting a ding-dong battle for the possession of Sandepu, succeeded in forcing back Oku's left. Gripenberg called for reinforcements, which were refused by

Kuropatkin. Enraged, he fell back on his original position, and an effort that had caused a heavy casualty list was fruitless in its result. Grippenberg was deprived of his command for insubordination.

Meanwhile Oyama strengthened Kuroki's right by a fifth army, and continued to impose on the Russians the idea of an offensive by Nogi against their left, though in reality Nogi's army was secretly stationed on the left bank of the Taitzu-ho. The three Russian armies kept their position on the Sha-ho, the first being stationed in the mountains on the left under Linevich. Bilderling commanded the third in the centre, Kaulbars the second, while the reserve was held at Mukden. The Japanese took the initiative, Kawamura attacking the Russian left, while Kuroki attacked Linevich. Kuropatkin, thoroughly deceived, hurried reserves to support his left, whereupon Nogi slipped out and supported Oku against the Russian right. Kuropatkin tried in vain a counter-attack against Nogi, and on 6 March was forced to retreat on Tieling, while, owing to the pressure of Nogi on the left, Linevich was ordered to retire on the fortified lines of Mukden, and for two days gallantly held his own. Meanwhile Bilderling and Kaulbars with difficulty held the lines of communication. The Russians reached the railway 80 miles north of Tieling, and the Japanese got within 12 miles of their outposts. But this was the only result of the battle which had waged round Mukden for fourteen days. Both sides were exhausted with heavy losses.

After the Dogger Bank mishap Rozhdestvensky's fleet pursued its leisurely course; after a halt at Madagascar he marshalled his squadrons in the China Sea. Togo had meanwhile perfected his arrangements for receiving information on the approach of the fleet, and was ready to anticipate a move to Port Arthur or to Vladivostock. On 27 May he received news that the Russian fleet was making for the Straits of Tsushima, and gave battle to the east of the island of Tsushima. In less than an hour the Japanese had obtained the mastery, and by evening the unity of the Russian fleet was shattered. The work was continued throughout the night by the Japanese torpedo boats, and by next day the destruction of the Russian fleet was complete.

This great naval victory ended the war, the Japanese had gained the mastery of the Pacific; but their operations on land had ended in stalemate. The war had become exceedingly unpopular in Russia, where it was regarded as a mad colonial venture, the loss from which had better be cut off; so when the last venture of the Baltic fleet failed, the mediation of the United States was accepted. In fact, it was acceptable to both belligerents, for the Japanese saw that they had no chance of bringing the campaign to a decisive issue.

Representatives of both countries met at Portsmouth, U.S.A., early in August, but the negotiations looked like failing owing to the Russian refusal to pay any war indemnity. However, at last the Japanese waived the monetary claim. The result of the Treaty of Portsmouth was that the influence of Japan in Korea was recognized; the Russians agreed to evacuate Manchuria and to cede to Japan the

Liao-Tung peninsula and Port Arthur. The moderation of the Japanese claims provoked popular wrath in Tokio, and serious riots took place. But in the light of recent information the wisdom of Japanese statesmanship has been justified; for it would have been useless to provoke a continuation of hostilities in the face of the latent Russian resources.

When the mismanagement and corruption displayed in the Japanese War became evident to the Russian people great indignation was aroused. The system of Plehve came to an end, and even his savage assassination was but conventionally regretted (28 July, 1904). The emperor deliberated for a month before appointing Prince Svyatopolk-Mirski as his successor. Prince Mirski had won golden opinions as an enlightened governor-general of Vilna, and his appointment was enthusiastically welcomed by the lovers of liberty of every shade and opinion. There was at once a welcome release from the rigid censorship of the Plehve régime. Prince Mirski immediately summoned an unofficial conference, which was open to zemstvos, at Petrograd on 19-22 November. The conference was attended by all the leading Liberals, and offered eleven points of reform for the emperor's consideration, the last of which, the establishment of an elected national assembly, causing a considerable difference of opinion, whether it should be legislative and consultative, but it was unanimously agreed that it should have control over finance.

The recommendations were received unofficially by Prince Mirski; the prospects of reform seemed rosy, and congratulatory telegrams and addresses poured in. Unfortunately the extreme views of the radical press caused a reaction, and the censorship and repression of public meetings were again resorted to. This policy was countered by a series of banquets and meetings attended by reformers of every class, nominally in celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the foundation of the law courts by Alexander II. Meanwhile the reverses in the Japanese War continued, and recruiting led to disorder. The emperor summoned his advisers and chief members of his family, and, in spite of the opposition of the grand dukes and the grand reactionary, Pobiedonosteff, by an edict of 25 December promised some reforms, extending from peasant legislation to a wider franchise for the zemstvos. But the edict was vague, and the reactionary party must have again obtained the upper hand, for it was followed by fresh repressive pronouncements which took off the gilt of the proposed reforms. Early in the new year, 1905, an attempt was made on the emperor's life, and the cause of immediate reform was dead. Nicholas retired to Tsarkoe Seló, and did not return to Petrograd for over a year.

During the course of 1904 the influence of a priest, Father Gapon, had become very marked among the factory workers of Petrograd; he had formed them into associations, ostensibly for the reform of the factory laws, but really to wring concessions from the employers. Failing in his attempt with them, a general strike was organized,

and it was decided that Father Gapon should head a monster deputation of strikers to present a petition to the emperor. The strikers were unarmed; but professing to see a plot against the person of the emperor in the demonstration, the military authorities ordered the troops to fire on the defenceless mob. Gapon made good his escape, and Prince Mirski was dismissed, to give way to yet another dictatorship in the person of General Trepoff. Trepoff had some Liberal sympathy, but was too much the child of bureaucracy to approach the situation with tact. He made a theatrical appeal to the patriotic feelings of the workmen, after staging a deputation to the emperor to ask forgiveness for recent events; but was confronted by a demand from manufacturers and men alike for full civil rights. The result, of course, was further repression and a period of dismal chaos. The whole country seemed in a state of rebellion; strikes took place in every city of importance and among the railway employees, and even the universities suspended their sessions. Assassinations were rife, culminating in the murder of the Grand Duke Sergius in the Kremlin. The general state of anarchy became desperate; the wiser counsels of prudence prevailed, and the emperor decided to hold out promises of an elective assembly. Meanwhile the Government announced some immediate reforms, such as a measure of religious toleration, rights of aliens to property, and concessions to Poles, Lithuanians, and Jews; further, the rigour of press censorship was relaxed.

In May, 1905, a great meeting of zemstvo leaders took place at Moscow, in which the various political unions of the professions, trades, and classes met on a common platform, under the presidency of Milyukoff, and became known as the "Union of Unions". Arrangements were made to hold meetings twice a month, and each union, after voicing its own immediate wants of reform, joined in the general demand for the summoning of an elective assembly.

The climax was reached after the news of the reverse at Mukden and the naval defeat of Tsushima. A coalition congress of Moderates and Liberals was held at Moscow on 6 June, and an address was framed for presentation to the emperor. The deputation, under the leadership of Prince Sergius Trubetskoy, was received most graciously by the emperor, who asseverated his firm intention of summoning national representatives and his desire for co-operation in reform. There followed some weeks of political unrest and agitation for a definite constitution—as the proposals for the foundation of a national assembly had leaked out and were considered inadequate — and revolutionary propaganda began to undermine the peasants and even the navy, resulting in the ugly mutiny on the *Prince Potemkin*. At last, on 19 August, 1905, appeared an Act establishing an Imperial Duma, which was to be consultative, and elected by a complicated and indirect system, by which various communities and classes elected delegates, and delegates in turn chose electors. But each class could only choose delegates from its own members, and a man could only be elected for his own district.

The terms of the constitution of the new Duma divided public opinion, whether the institution should be given support or not; but a zemstvo congress held on 25 September decided to elect for the Duma, with a view to obtaining greater powers for it. A measure of self-government for the universities did not produce the results anticipated for it. A revolutionary movement was inaugurated by the students; lectures of a violently Socialistic character were thrown open to the public, and some university buildings had to be closed. The general unrest spread to the peasants; there were some outrages, but in the main the Peasant Union was loyal to the throne, although it embraced a strong radical land programme.

During the month of October strikes increased, and the workers on most of the railways and in the principal factories came out; but on the strike assuming gigantic proportions on 27 October, involving professional men, newspapers, light and water supply, and the institution of a reign of terror, the Government was forced to give way.

The emperor thereupon dismissed Pobyedonosteff and Trepoff, and recalled Count Witte with the new post of Prime Minister. Acting on Witte's advice, an imperial manifesto appeared on 30 October promising freedom of conscience, speech, meeting and association, and an extended franchise; moreover the Duma was to become legislative. The manifesto was exceedingly distasteful to the official class, and especially to the police; it had a sobering effect upon the Constitutional Democrats, while it completely satisfied the Moderates or Octobrists under Shipoff. Witte offered Shipoff a post in the ministry, but Shipoff would only consent on condition that the Constitutional Democrats were included; but their extravagant demands proved insuperable, and Witte had to rely upon the Moderates, the reactionary, Durnovo, becoming Minister of the Interior.

Meanwhile political agitation broke out in Finland and Poland, and there was a mutiny among the sailors in the fleet at Cronstadt. Witte then tried to propitiate the press by a press law giving great licence provided nothing immoral or criminal was printed; the expression "criminal", however, being interpreted in a very wide sense. The revolutionary propaganda spread to the peasants, serious revolts occurred, and the crisis became acute when several garrisons in large towns openly mutinied.

The reactionary party, under Durnovo, now began to take action, and severe repression became the order of the day. A third strike was declared at Petrograd, and in Moscow a rising took place which was savagely suppressed by the military, resulting in the loss of many innocent lives.

The events of the Moscow rising caused great feeling throughout the country, and Count Witte advocated another concession to the desire for popular representation. On 24 December a decree was issued so extending the franchise that in the election for the Duma it practically became universal. But the effect of the reform was lost in the repressive measures of Durnovo, while the reactionary society of bureau-

cratic sympathizers known as the "Union of the Russian People" committed great excesses with the connivance of the police.

Early in the spring of 1906 the election for the first Duma took place. The reactionaries were practically excluded, so the fight lay between the Moderates (Octobrists) and the Constitutional Democrats (Cadets), and ended in a victory for the Cadets, while the Octobrists gave way even to the Labour group which had been formed from the Peasants' Union. Witte resigned the premiership and was succeeded by Goremykin, an old man and a friend of the emperor; the most prominent member of the Government being Stolypin, the Minister for the Interior.

The Duma was received by the emperor at the Winter Palace with a patriotic speech which offered the members no light to guide their deliberations. The Cadets were, of course, in the ascendancy, and at once framed an address to the throne that claimed for the Duma the right of control over the executive and its complete legislative powers. Goremykin's reply defining the functions of the Duma, and outlining a programme of his own, was received with marked disapproval, and a practically unanimous vote of censure was passed upon the ministry. A deadlock ensued; the emperor took no immediate steps to form a fresh ministry, and the Duma proceeded to pass Bills to consolidate its privileges, while it developed into an open court of criticism of the actions of the administration and of the persecutions of the bureaucratic reactionaries. A crisis was reached on the land proposals of the Cadets; the emperor sent for Shipoff, the leader of the Octobrists, and asked him to form a Cabinet. Shipoff again refused unless the Cadets could be included. But Milyukoff, the leader of the Cadets, refused to form a coalition, and the emperor was confronted with the choice between the Cadets and the Bureaucrats.

Finally Nicholas sent for Prince Stolypin, who had been gradually adding to his parliamentary reputation, and appointed him premier with instructions to dissolve the Duma immediately. The notice of the dissolution was posted in public without due notice to the president. A second Duma was summoned for 5 March, and after the issuing of an imperial manifesto of blame, military precautions were taken on a large scale in Petrograd against disturbances. The chief officers of the Duma and the Cadets and Labour party thereupon retired to Viborg, where they issued an impassioned proclamation to the nation not to assist the Government by paying taxes, granting recruits, or assuming the obligations of foreign loans until the Duma was restored.

Stolypin was not frightened by the Viborg demonstration, and instituted a rigorous policy for the preservation of authority; he would not allow the Government to be threatened by violence. He instituted field courts martial against the terrorism of the revolutionary Socialists and suspected conspirators in general, and imprisonment and banishment were resorted to on a huge scale. Stolypin endeavoured to bring in the leaders of the Moderates with him, but he was not sufficiently Liberal for them to bestow their confidence upon him. But, if the

premier could not win support from the parties of liberation, he was regarded as an extreme Radical by the Bureaucrats, who renewed the malevolent machinations of their society, "The Union of the Russian People", and endeavoured to gain the ear of the emperor on the score of their loyalty.

The elections for the new Duma gave the dominance to the Cadets, although the Social Democrats showed a formidable front. The Duma met on 5 March, 1907, amidst almost melodramatic conditions of espionage and suspicion, and from the first the meetings were subject to the obstructive tactics of the small reactionary party, pledged to kill the institution. The Court party became very active; a plot was alleged to have been discovered against the life of the emperor, and on certain sections of the Duma seeing through the ruse, a vote of congratulation to the emperor was passed in a small house. The Social Democrats were then accused of conspiracy; Stolypin was forced to ask for the exclusion of the Social Democrats from the house, and the accused persons for the first time heard of the indictment prepared against them. The Duma had no time to investigate the matter, for on 16 June a manifesto appeared dissolving the house, on the ground that it did not really represent the popular will, and a new electoral law was promised. The law promptly followed, and its effect was to deprive the opposition of seats on a wholesale scale, and to disfranchise many classes, the country members becoming preponderant. Meanwhile the Government wreaked its vengeance on its enemies. Social Democrats were exiled to Siberia after a secret trial; those who had signed the Viborg manifesto were imprisoned; political offenders were executed for deeds committed in 1905; the police were armed with special powers against the writers of seditious articles, and repressive measures were hurled against the universities and recalcitrant lawyers. The result of this reactionary policy was to increase the social disorder and unrest in the provinces.

The elections for the third Duma were held in October, 1907; as a result of the new law, the character of the assembly became completely altered, and acquired a more aristocratic complexion. The arbitrary methods by which the second Duma had been dissolved had been successful in clipping the wings of extreme radicalism, and the power in the new Duma was seized by the Octobrists under the leadership of Guchkoff, who supported Stolypin against the forces of reaction. For the first time the Duma co-operated to a certain extent with the Government, but the budget was allowed to run the gauntlet of a fierce criticism, especially the estimates for the navy and army. The reactionaries made several attempts to undermine the authority of Stolypin, but the prime minister adroitly managed to parry the attacks, and gradually as his Government grew more stable resorted to a milder rule, which ended in a personal triumph by the passing of the Fundamental (Land) Law.

Before leaving the question of Russian reform we ought to give a glance to the affairs of two nationalities which have been absorbed by

great Russia—Finland and Poland. When Finland was annexed by Alexander I in 1809 he took a solemn oath to the estates to respect their constitution and laws, and in 1869, during the reign of Alexander II, the Finns obtained further guarantees. By the constitution the sovereign rules not by right of his Russian crown, but by being grand-duke of Finland. The affairs of the nation are governed by Diet and Senate. By the constitution taxation cannot be imposed or altered without the consent of the Diet. In spite of certain drawbacks this constitution in the main worked well, and from the time of the annexation up to 1886 Finland made great strides in prosperity and wealth, offering a contrast of well-being to the rest of Russia.

Towards the end of the reign of Alexander III the Bureaucrats had their eye on the independent position of Finland. Alexander's policy was Slavophil; that is to say, he wished to promote the complete unity of Russian nationality, and he wanted to see Finland, as well as Poland, conform to the institution of the empire. As grand-duke he stretched the power of the constitution to harmonize coinage, postal service, and customs with those of Russia, and in 1891 he tried to make the Russian language compulsory in the government of Finland. Thereupon a regular attack was instituted by the Bureaucrats against the Finnish constitution by the device of setting up a committee to "interpret" the law of procedure between Russia and Finland in common matters, which they alleged was not clearly defined. Owing to the opposition to the committee in Finland, Alexander III allowed the matter to drop. But the accession of Nicholas II, who adhered to his father's creed, brought about a further interference in Finnish affairs. The appointment of Kuropatkin as Minister of War for Russia coincided with an attack on Finnish liberties. He reopened the case for the military Bureaucrats, who made some show of justice in the fact that Finland did not bear her fair share of the military burden of empire, and gained the ear of Nicholas II. Suddenly in February, 1899, appeared an imperial manifesto which, while pretending to guarantee the autonomy of Finland in purely Finnish affairs, proclaimed the necessity of revising the constitution to suit the greater needs of the empire as a whole.

The Finns at once recognized in this manifesto the threatened abolition of the legislative powers of their Diet, and impressive meetings were held throughout the land to testify their grief. A monster petition was signed, representative of the whole nation; but the emperor refused to receive the delegates who brought it. The attempt to Russify Finland proceeded. The army, in spite of determined Finnish opposition, was merged in that of Russia, together with the postal system, while the censorship of the Press was rigorously introduced, and the Police passed under Russian control.

All these things were done under the governorship of Bobrikoff, who was appointed in 1898. To resist his efforts an orderly passive resistance was instituted. Everybody with responsibilities, great or small, refused to serve—and Bobrikoff was powerless. In 1904 he was assassinated,

and the movement of resistance passed into the hands of the Social Democrats. In 1905 a great national strike broke out, and the emperor issued a manifesto in which Finnish liberties were to be restored and universal suffrage was promised. Meanwhile conflicts took place between the advanced Socialists under the "Red Guard" and the party of law and order, known as the "White Guard", to the ultimate discomfiture of the Red Guard. The new Diet, elected by universal suffrage, met in 1907, but, owing to the wildness of the Socialists, was dissolved in 1908. Under the pressure of the reactionaries, who traced the trouble in Finland to Russian revolutionaries, Stolypin issued a proclamation that all State matters of imperial welfare belonged to the Cabinet for discussion, and that the Secretary for Finland must report to it and not to the Sovereign. The work of Finnish Russification thus entered on another phase, and the defence of Finnish liberties still proceeds.

Poland after the insurrection of 1863 was remodelled, and measures were taken, especially concessions to the peasantry with a view to estranging them from the aristocracy, to Russianize the country. The pacific measures, however, failed in their object, and the imperial policy could only be effected by the sternest repression, which spread to schools and national institutions. The Russian language became compulsory, and Government posts were entirely in the hands of Russians. The latent energy of young Poland took to trade, and Polish commerce increased during twenty years with astonishing rapidity. With this increase there of course arose a large working-class wedded to the doctrines of Socialism, with the inevitable strikes, and the desire of setting up an independent democratic republic. Opposed directly to this party was the section, largely aristocratic, known as the "conciliators", who hoped for a measure of autonomy similar to that enjoyed by their brethren under Austrian rule in Galicia; but they inspired no confidence in Petrograd. The ablest political party was the "Middle Party", to which belonged the best of Polish thought, out of which rose the National Democrats under the leadership of Dmowski, who advocated a sane assertion of national independence. For some time an armed rising was aimed at, but since the beginning of the century Dmowski's policy has been to play off the different partners in the Partition against each other, and especially to make matters warm for Germany, with a view to obtaining autonomy within the Russian empire. This policy has recently been crowned with success by the announcement of the emperor, at the outbreak of the world war, of the restoration of Polish nationality under Russian suzerainty.

A word or two about Russian foreign policy since the beginning of the century. The keynote of that policy has been opposition to Germany; slowly but surely the Slavophil policy, sometimes reactionary and sometimes popular in its direction, has overcome the enormous German influence which has been so baleful for true Russian development. It was something gained when Russian bureaucracy was no

longer under the influence of Potsdam bureaucracy, and Pan-Germanism was unmasked as hatred of the Slav. The disastrous result of the war with Japan alienated the last remnant of traditional friendship for Germany, as it was owing to German influence that Russia was elbowed into that war. But the German plans went very much agley; the Russians did not embroil themselves for years, as had been supposed, in an Asiatic venture, to the detriment of their Western interests, nor did the powers of reaction prevail. The establishment of the Duma was one blow to German hopes; but another, and far greater, was the understanding between Great Britain and Russia. This understanding was made possible by the splendid stability of the alliance with France, who earnestly desired the foundation of a triple entente against German aggression, and the sounder diplomatic advice which Nicholas received from Great Britain with regard to Japan. The emperor realized that he had better friends in London than in Berlin, and the constitutional reforms he had granted procured for him an increased sympathy from democratic Britain. The outstanding differences between France and Great Britain had been obliterated in 1904, and the signing of an Anglo-Russian agreement in 1907 defining the Asian spheres in the two countries brought about the Triple Entente, which received its crowning sanction by the successful State visit of the Emperor Nicholas to these shores in 1909.

When Austria-Hungary in 1908 seized the opportunity of the Young Turks' rebellion to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, Russia, with the diplomatic assistance of Great Britain and France, endeavoured to come to the assistance of Serbia and Montenegro, but she had not sufficiently recovered from the exhaustion of the Japanese War, and was consequently not in a position to back her representations by a show of arms. The Kaiser inflicted a direct humiliation on Russia, and made a bombastic speech in which he appeared "in shining armour" by the side of his ally. The speech sunk deep into Russian amour-propre, and henceforth the policy of Pan-Slavism received an enormous impetus, which gathered further weight by the comparative failure of Pan-German diplomacy during the Balkan Wars.

CHAPTER XIV

THE BALKAN STATES

To include every Balkan State in a section devoted to Pan-Slavism may perhaps seem a somewhat arbitrary proceeding, for all the States of the Balkan Peninsula do not possess a Slavonic origin—and Rumania sometimes even objects to be considered Balkan at all—but they all possess a common cause, deliverance from the Ottoman yoke; and this common cause, together with the Slavonic championship of Russia, provides a show of reason for a very convenient arrangement. Further,

in writing of the Balkan States from the point of view of this fixity of purpose, to win their independence, we illustrate the history of Turkey since 1870, for it is interwoven with the history of that struggle. Otherwise Ottoman domestic disorders and palace intrigues possess no interest for us.

The year 1870 is a landmark in the Near East, for in that year modern Bulgaria makes her first appearance upon the stage of European politics. The creation of the Bulgarian exarchate¹ on 10 March, 1870, by Abdul Aziz freed Bulgaria from the sway of the Patriarch of Constantinople in religious matters, and restored her nationality by ridding her of the Hellenizing propaganda of the Patriarchs. In fact, "the ecclesiastical ascendancy of the Greeks had crushed Bulgarian nationality more completely than even the civil power of the Turks".² The Patriarch naturally fulminated against the schism, but it was approved of by Russia, who, as Holy Russia and champion of the Orthodox Christians, feared a day when Greek influence might be very real at Constantinople. It should be noted that the imposition of Greek churches and schools on the Bulgarians must be traced to the Greeks of Thrace and not of Athens, who had no jurisdiction over them. The Turk saw in the arrangement a further source of discord for his hated Christian subjects. Early in the century the Rumanians and the Serbians had obtained their ecclesiastical independence, although Serbia is counted as "Greek" by the Ottoman authority. The consequence was that the Bulgarian Exarch had a distinct pull in proselytizing in Macedonia, and was able to create Bulgarians, often at the expense of Serbia. The rivalry for the possession of Macedonia is the central fact of the Eastern Question.

After the successful conclusion of the war with Turkey in 1878, Russia by the Treaty of San Stefano endeavoured to create a great Bulgaria, the result of which would have been to make her the most powerful of the Balkan kingdoms. Apart from the natural protests of Greece at the wholesale inclusion of territories that were racially Greek, the scheme received the veto of Austria-Hungary, who desired no strong Slav power at her doors, and of Great Britain, who saw in a large Bulgaria nothing but a great Russian state at the very gates of Constantinople. Consequently, after the Congress of Berlin, a smaller Bulgaria was only recognized with its dominions to the north of the Balkan mountains, while Eastern Rumelia became a vassal state of the sultan, with a Christian governor-general. By the same treaty, as has already been noted, Serbia received an increase of territory at Nish and Vrania and in the district of Pirot, while her independence was acknowledged; Montenegro doubled her possessions and obtained the port of Antivari, but was forced to cede her conquests of Dulcigno and Spizza. Rumania was exceedingly badly treated in the division of spoil, as she was forced to yield Bessarabia to Russia, in exchange for the barren Dobrudja, more valuable, however, than at the time it appeared; while Greece, who had kept out of the war at the pressure of the Powers, had

¹ A separate ecclesiastical territory with an "exarch" as its religious head.

² Jacob Gerald Schurman's *The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913*.

to be contented with a protocol recommending the rectification of her frontier, which was only partially accomplished after a considerable lapse of time. Bosnia and Herzegovina passed under the suzerainty of Austria-Hungary.

By the vote of the Chamber, 29 April, 1879, the throne of Bulgaria was offered to Prince Alexander of Battenberg, of the house of Hesse-Darmstadt by a morganatic marriage. Although only twenty-two years of age he accepted the heavy responsibility, and was received with popular enthusiasm at Sofia. His difficulties began immediately, for he found the kingdom completely under the heel of the Russian governor of the interregnum, Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff, who was treating the realm as if it were a Russian province and filling all the chief posts with Russians, to the bitter discontent of the native patriots. On the Pan-Slavonic intrigues becoming too much for him, Prince Alexander, in 1880, repaired to Petrograd to obtain redress from the emperor. Accepting the dictum of the emperor, and Russian interference as a necessary evil, the young prince's lot improved for a while. Acting on the advice of the Russian general, Ehrenroth, he suspended the constitution and carried a decree of a Septennate. The emperor sent him three generals to prop up his rule; but on these informing him that they took their orders from Petrograd and not from him, in pique as well as from the necessity of self-preservation he turned towards Karaveloff and the moderate Liberals, to the discomfiture of the Russians. But a great leader had arisen for the Nationalist party in the person of Stefan Stambuloff, who later earned the reputation of being the "Bismarck of the Bulgarians". Stambuloff wished his country to have a real national existence, and not to be the mere vassal state of Russia. Prince Alexander decided to restore the constitution, and the Russian officials retired in high dudgeon. Alexander III was furious at this show of independence on the part of his cousin, and struggled to undermine his influence, even going so far as to sanction an unsuccessful plot to kidnap him. Meanwhile Stambuloff had become president of the Sobranje and a warm adherent of Prince Alexander's anti-Russian policy.

The movement for union between the Bulgarians of Eastern Rumelia and their brethren of the Northern kingdom had been growing in volume ever since the diplomatic settlement of 1879. The Pan-Slavonic societies of Russia had encouraged the movement by the foundation of "gymnastic societies" in Eastern Rumelia, which were in reality training societies for young men to learn the use of arms; but by mismanagement the control of the movement slipped from Russian hands into those of the capable Stambuloff. In 1885 matters came to a crisis, and the unionist cause made great strides at Philippopolis—in fact, to the amazement of Prince Alexander himself, as he explained to many leading diplomatists.

Suddenly, on 18 September, 1885, the Turkish governor, Garvil Pasha, was seized and driven over the border. Alexander marched south to Philippopolis, but hesitated to accept the crown of Greater

Bulgaria which was offered him. However, he was overruled by the advice of Stambuloff, who strongly urged him to accept it, pointing out that he had the choice between Philippopolis or Darmstadt.

The diplomacy of Stambuloff had proved too much for Alexander III, who gave way to uncontrollable rage at the expense of his luckless kinsman; the Russian plans had gone hopelessly astray. The Russian officers were recalled from Sofia, and Muscovite pressure was brought to bear upon the sultan, to stir up revenge against Prince Alexander by the restoration of the *status quo* in Eastern Rumelia. Meanwhile the aggrandisement of Bulgaria had caused alarm in the rest of the peninsula; Serbia and Greece both demanded territorial concessions, and Crete again announced her union with Greece.

The difficulties of the general situation alone prevented Russia from chastising Bulgaria for her presumption; but she found herself tied by the strength of the Triple Alliance, her own internal disorders, and the changed attitude of Great Britain towards the Porte. Lord Salisbury had just succeeded to office, and saw the wisdom of Sir William White's advice—the British ambassador at Constantinople—who preferred to see strong independent states in the Balkans that might serve as buffers between the Slavonic ambition of Russia and the *Drang nach osten* (call to the East) of Germany and Austria-Hungary. He warned the sultan not to interfere in Eastern Rumelia; a warning which was not lost on the monarch, who was threatened with domestic conspiracy at home, and abroad was suspicious of the intentions of Serbia and Greece.

An ambassadorial conference of the Powers was held at Constantinople, 5 November, 1885, in which Sir William White brought pressure to bear upon the sultan to induce him to acknowledge the Bulgarian Union. France was not inclined to back Austria or Russia, and the Turk began to see the wisdom of the British policy. The consolidation of Bulgaria was accomplished.

Meanwhile the jealousy of Serbia at the bloodless triumph of her rival had overstepped the bounds of reason, and King Milan seized the pretext of the harm done to Serbian trade interests by a recently imposed tariff to wage war against Bulgaria. The situation of Bulgaria looked desperate, deserted as she was on all sides; but the intense national spirit of her people prevailed. The Bulgarian officers who had so recently filled the Russian vacancies proved enthusiastic leaders, and the colossal difficulties of transport were brilliantly overcome. In spite of some initial successes the Serbians were hopelessly beaten at Slivnitza, and the road to Belgrade lay open for the Bulgarians. At this critical juncture Austria intervened. An ultimatum was dispatched to Prince Alexander to bid him advance no farther and to grant the Serbians an armistice, under pain of instant Austrian reprisals. The bravery of Prince Alexander against such pressure would have been unavailing, so he was forced to submit to the inevitable. A treaty was concluded between the two States at Bukarest by which the *status quo* was established.

The personal triumph of Prince Alexander still further increased the animosity of the emperor, Alexander III. The activity of his agents in Bulgaria increased, and Europe was threatened with war. The Pan-Slavists were enthusiastic at the emperor's attitude, and strong threats were directed against Turkey and Austria-Hungary. But suddenly an event occurred which diverted the imperial wrath. A Russian military plot had been brewing for some time in Sofia, directed by certain officers dissatisfied with their reward for services in the Serbian campaign, especially Bendereff, who had been rebuked for discourtesy to the prince. Bendereff gained over the Struma regiment, and in his capacity of Minister of War dispatched the faithful troops from Sofia to the frontier on a plea of alleged Serbian aggression. On the night of 21 August the Struma regiment returned to Sofia, surrounded the palace, while the ringleaders burst into Prince Alexander's bedroom. The prince endeavoured to escape, but was driven into a corner of the palace, and compelled by a show of revolver and bayonet to sign his abdication. The conspirators forced him into a carriage and placed him on the royal yacht, which conveyed him to Russian territory. After being detained by the Russians at Reni, Prince Alexander was allowed to escape to Austria.

The indignation caused by this dastardly deed strengthened the hand of the patriot, Stambuloff, who threw himself might and main into the work of upsetting the provisional government of the arch-plotters, Bishop Clement and Zankoff. A telegram was dispatched to Prince Alexander urging him to return. The prince at once consented to such a strongly voiced popular wish, and returned to Bulgarian soil to be acclaimed as a great national hero. Misled by the friendly attitude of the Russian consul general on his return, the prince, in the absence of Stambuloff, was induced to send a telegram of submission to the Russian emperor. The trap succeeded: Alexander's reply was one of strong disapproval of the prince's return. This unexpected reply was a crushing blow to Alexander, who by this time had lost his nerve. Immediately on his arrival at the palace he summoned his officers around him and announced his abdication. The expostulations of the loyal Stambuloff were in vain, and after appointing that statesman together with Mutkuroff and Kavancloff as regents, Prince Alexander of Battenberg on the morning of 8 September left Bulgaria for ever.

Ostensibly to restore order the Russian emperor dispatched General Kaulbars on a special mission to Sofia. On arriving, the envoy's first action was to order the release of the military plotters, and the adjournment of the election for the Sobranje; but his bullying tactics were of no avail against the iron-willed Stambuloff, who refused his demands and proceeded with the elections. The Sobranje met in due course at Tirnova and elected Prince Waldemar of Denmark to the vacant throne, but as the appointment was disapproved of at Petrograd that prince was forced to decline the honour. The throne of Bulgaria then went a-begging for six months, during which period Stambuloff be-

came the virtual dictator of the country. At last the Bulgarian delegates, who had been proceeding from capital to capital in search of a candidate, found one who was suitable in Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, a grandson of Louis Philippe. In spite of the efforts of Russian diplomacy against him, he was unanimously elected by the Sobranje on 7 July, 1887. The new prince had none of the military ardour of Prince Alexander, was studious in his habits, but a good diplomat. He was content to remain in the background during the opening years of his reign, while Stambuloff defended the interests of the young state against Russian intrigue. Stambuloff's policy was to cultivate friendly relations with Turkey and encourage the propagandist efforts of the exarchate in Macedonia. In 1893 Prince Ferdinand married Princess Marie-Louise of Parma, and the birth of an heir, Prince Boris, settled his hold on the Bulgarian throne. From this time the prince's relations with Stambuloff grew more strained, and at last the minister resigned. In 1895 the great man was foully murdered by three assassins in the streets of Sofia. The dismissal of the hated minister, and the conversion of the infant Prince Boris to the orthodox faith, bridged the gap with Russia, and Prince Ferdinand was formally acknowledged at Petrograd.

After her unsuccessful war with Bulgaria, Serbian history was clouded by the scandalous quarrels of the royal family. King Milan possessed a vicious character, and his beautiful consort, Queen Nathalie, was exceedingly self-willed; moreover, the differences between the royal pair were further increased by a difference in political affections—the king favoured the Austrians, while the queen was Russian by birth and sentiment. At last, in 1889, King Milan obtained a divorce; therefore to celebrate the event he granted the Serbians a Liberal Constitution, and shortly afterwards abdicated in favour of his son, Alexander. The young king, being a minor, only thirteen years of age, was placed under the care of three regents, the Serbian statesman, Jovan Ristich, being their chief. Four years later young Alexander suddenly startled the world by unexpectedly arresting his guardians, declaring himself of age, and dissolving the Skuptschina. On 21 May he abolished the constitution which his father had granted in 1889, and began an attack on the Radical and Russophil parties. His political power, however, ended by his imprudent marriage with Draga Mashin, a former maid of honour to Queen Nathalie, and a woman of doubtful character. No child was born of the union, and the suspicion that Queen Draga was plotting to obtain the succession for one of her own brothers rendered the king unpopular, an unpopularity which he endeavoured to check by the granting of a new constitution with the safeguard of a second Chamber. But the raising of the standard of the pretender, Peter Karageorgevitch, at Shabats in 1902 caused King Alexander to rescind the newly granted constitution until he was rid of his Radical enemies. Thereupon followed the most cynical conspiracy and revolting murder of modern times. The conspirators were all officers, who

had taken the oath of allegiance, under the leadership of Colonel Mashin, a brother-in-law of Queen Draga. A disloyal regiment guarded all the entrances, and on the night of 19 June, 1903, the conspirators burst into the palace. The king and queen were found together and murdered under the most revolting circumstances; when their bloody work had been accomplished the guilty officers threw the mangled bodies out of the window. The assassins next disposed of the two brothers of the queen, as well as the prime minister and the minister for war; the whole callousness of the exploit being crowned by the order for general public rejoicing.

With the assassination of King Alexander passed away the last of the Obrenovitch line, and Peter Karageorgevitch, who had spent most of his life in exile, was placed upon the throne. The circumstances, however, of his accession, together with the fact that the regicides for a long time remained about his person, caused the new king to be boycotted by all the European nations except Austria and Russia, whose political interests made some show of recognition necessary. On such unstable foundations the Karageorgevitch dynasty was bound to be the prey of the unscrupulous palace adventurers, and the antics of the Crown Prince George were an unending source of anxiety to the State, until that bright youth was induced to resign his claims to the throne. A tariff war with Austria was highly prejudicial to her commerce, therefore it may be said that Serbia remained under a cloud until she emerged in a burst of glory in the recent days of the Balkan League and Wars. At present she is earning the admiration of the world for the gallant defence she is showing to the powerful onslaught of her neighbour, Austria-Hungary.

We must now give a glance to Turkish affairs. After the Treaty of Berlin for a few years Turkey enjoyed some measure of peace. Abdul Hamid set to work to consolidate his own absolutism and free himself entirely from the dominion of the bureaucrats, while to compensate himself for the loss of territory he endeavoured to build up the sanctity of his person as khalif, or head of Islam. This led him into a policy of persecution of his Christian subjects, especially in Armenia and Macedonia. The Armenians, less able to take care of themselves than their Christian neighbours owing to the lack of a powerful protector, at the Congress of Berlin, 1878, had petitioned for the appointment of a Christian governor; but the Congress had other interests in hand, and the Armenians were put off with a promise of reforms. Nothing, however, came of the promises, with the exception of a desultory consular enquiry by Great Britain, until the attention of Europe was drawn to the miserable lot of the Armenian Christians in 1889, in which year Abdul Hamid, growing suspicious of the Armenians, began to persecute them as a "peril" to the State. The savage Kurds in 1894, aided by Turkish troops, destroyed twenty-four villages in the district of Sasun and slaughtered the inhabitants under circumstances of unthinkable cruelty. The Powers, especially Great Britain, demanded a commission of enquiry, to be accompanied by their own



ABDUL HAMID, SULTAN OF TURKEY

(Deposed 1909)

From a photograph by W. & D. Downey

representatives. The enquiry was duly granted and made, but was conducted in a partial and futile way. The Powers then presented a scheme of Armenian reform which fell on deaf ears, and further outrages occurred at Trebizond (30 September, 1895); moreover, while the sultan was promising faithfully to execute these very reforms massacre on a wholesale scale was being perpetrated in Asia Minor.

Maddened by the inaction of the Powers and the flabby resignation of their own Patriarch, Armenians seized the Ottoman Bank in Constantinople, and refused to give it up unless a safe-conduct was given them under the protection of the ambassadors. Then the sultan showed his real intentions, and exacted a frightful vengeance from the Armenians of Constantinople. For two days the streets of Constantinople were given up to organized massacre, resulting in the murder of 6000 Armenian victims. Again self-interest proved too much for the Powers. Gladstone thundered, and France spurned the Red Assassin; but the guilty author of the crime went unpunished, Germany even going out of her way to be conciliatory with a view to feathering her own nest. The whole episode was mean and contemptible for Powers rejoicing in the style of "Christian".

Diplomats turned a conveniently deaf ear to the cries of the miserable Armenians owing to the resuscitation of the Cretan question. By what is known as the Pact of Halefa, 25 October, 1878, Crete had been granted a supplementary constitution to one already sanctioned in 1868. The constitution provided a Christian governor-general, to hold office for five years, with a Mussulman assistant, and a General Assembly of forty-nine Christians and thirty-one Mussulmans. Greek was to be the official language, and other concessions were made in favour of the natives. The new charter worked smoothly, and provided a measure of happiness for the Cretans under Greek governors, especially Photiades Pasha, until the year 1889, when an insurrection due to Christian jealousies broke out. Abdul Hamid seized the chance to appoint a Mussulman governor-general, which in effect was tantamount to revoking the benefits of the Pact. This action gave rise to a period of constant disturbance, and at last in 1895 the sultan reappointed a Christian and Greek governor. The fanatical Moslems, feeling slighted, took reprisals from the Christians; the Greek governor, Karatheodori, was recalled, and again a Turkish governor was appointed. The situation grew intolerable, and an insurrection broke out in Canea, 24 May, 1896. Thoroughly alarmed, Abdul Hamid renewed his promises of the Pact of Halefa, reappointed a Christian governor, and set up commissions of reform. The usual delay in effecting the reforms occurred, and both sides grew suspicious; a massacre of Christians took place at Canea, whereupon the Christians in their turn, after occupying Akrotiri, and taking advantage of the success of the Bulgarian union, proclaimed their union with the kingdom of Greece.

The greatest popular excitement prevailed in Greece, which it was impossible for the king to keep in check. Prince George sailed

with a flotilla of torpedo-boats from the Piræus to cover the landing of a Greek expeditionary force under Colonel Vassos. A mixed fleet of the Powers occupied Cretan waters; the admirals, having in vain ordered the withdrawal of the Greek troops, were compelled to bombard the insurgents of Akrotiri, who had attacked the Turks, and the island was blockaded. The warlike spirit spread to Greece, a spirit which the king, though probably reluctantly, was forced from motives of policy to encourage. Armed bands of patriotic volunteers crossed the Thessalian and Macedonian frontiers on 9 April, 1897, and a few days later Turkey declared war. The conflict was promptly localized on the part of the sultan by concessions to Bulgaria and Serbia, and on the part of Austria and Russia by a joint note of warning to Bukarest, Belgrade, and Sofia. Greece was quite unprepared for war; the navy accomplished nothing, although superior in every way to that of the Turks, while on land the Greek army was outclassed by the Turkish troops, who had recently been schooled in the best German military methods. The Crown Prince's army fled in disorder from Edhem Pasha at Larissa, and a hostile crowd made a demonstration before the royal palace at Athens, an attack on the king being with difficulty prevented. The further successes of the Turks in Epiros, culminating in the decisive victory of Domolos, caused further panic in Athens, and the position of the royal family became precarious in the extreme. At this juncture the Powers intervened, an armistice was signed, and the forces of Colonel Vassos were recalled from Crete. A treaty was subsequently concluded at Constantinople by which the Turks restored Thessaly to Greece and obtained a war indemnity of four millions, which was to be under the control of European financiers. After the conclusion of peace the history of Greece was fairly uneventful, the kingdom being occupied in wise internal reforms and the consolidating of her resources. The attitude of the Young Turks in 1909 caused military alarm, and calls for reform in the army almost caused the abdication of the royal house. The summoning of M. Venizelos in 1910 as Prime Minister proved of immense advantage. Thanks to his able diplomacy as the master-spirit in the Balkan League, and the splendid exploits of the Greek navy and army during the Balkan Wars, Greece has emerged as a great factor in the destinies of the Near East, while the spoils of conquest have made her a considerable maritime Power. The settlement of the Cretan question proved exceedingly difficult for the Powers, who sought a governor. Prince George of Greece was eventually appointed high commissioner; but before he could land, an attack was made upon the British in Candia and the vice-consul was murdered. Admiral Noel acted promptly, bombarded the town, hanged the ringleaders, and insisted on the withdrawal of Turkish troops. Under the governorship of Prince George, which lasted for eight years, although the appointment had only been granted for three, Crete enjoyed five years of tranquillity; a constitution was drawn up, and the idea of her autonomy was fostered. But in 1904 there arose considerable discontent, when Prince George was at variance with

M. Venezelos, the leader of the Cretan opposition, and subsequent brilliant Greek Prime Minister. Venezelos retired to the mountains and proclaimed the Cretan union with Greece. Weary of the incessant turmoil of Cretan politics, Prince George resigned his office of high commissioner and returned to Athens. The Powers then entrusted King George with the task of appointing a successor, and his choice fell upon Zaimis, a Conservative politician. In 1908 Crete again, on the occasion of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary, asserted her union with Greece, but the consummation of this wish had to wait until the final settlement of the Balkan War in 1913.

The Cretan troubles having been smoothed, the tale of woe is next transferred to Macedonia. The problem of the Macedonian Christians is more complex than that of Armenia, owing to racial overlapping. For centuries Macedonia had been the shuttlecock for Greek, Bulgarian, and Serbian interests until its final overthrow by the Ottomans. The Christians of Macedonia, ground down by Turkish oppression, turned to their neighbours for assistance, with the result that Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia, in the nominal interests of Christianity, became vigorous propagandists of their own nationalities, or, in other words, in the guise of religion each nation revived racial hatred to establish spheres of interest. The confusion in this struggle for Macedonia was increased by the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate; for, as has already been noted, whereas formerly all the Christians had been under Greek sway, now there was division of allegiance between the Patriarchists and the Exarchists. A community could transfer its allegiance from the one party to the other by a petition of two-thirds of the inhabitants; the result was that Macedonia tended to become sharply divided between Greek and Bulgarian interests, to the disgust of Rumania and Serbia, who, equally interested in acquiring, when the time should be ripe, a slice of the Macedonian cake, clamoured for the restoration of their own national churches.

In 1899 the "Macedonian Committee" of Sofia forwarded a memorial to the Powers to ask for an autonomous Macedonia under a Bulgarian governor-general; but, believing that deeds are better than words, the committee dispatched armed bands into Macedonian territory. The Albanians of "Old Serbia" started a feud, and the state of unrest in the region became so great that Austria and Russia, at Vienna in February, 1903, drew up a scheme of reforms for the three vilayets of Salonica, Monastir, and Kossovo, with the appointment of an inspector-general. The scheme was accepted by the sultan, but the result was added confusion. The Albanians rose in revolt at Kossovo, while the Bulgarians committed excesses and harried the Greeks. Austria and Russia then drew up a second programme of reform at Mürtsteg in October, 1903. This programme was again accepted by the sultan; Austrian and Russian civil agents were attached to the inspector-general, Hilmi, and the gendarmerie was placed under the reorganizing command of an Italian general, while Macedonia was divided into five sections under the military command of officers

appointed by the Great Powers, except Germany. Macedonia seemed to be settling down, when in the autumn of 1905 the old racial animosities were stirred up again by the sudden incursion of a Greek band, under Paul Melas, and there followed bloody struggles between the Patriarchists and the Exarchists in the name of Christianity. These squabbles even spread beyond the border, and Bulgarians and Rumanians harried the Greeks in their domains. Tired of the state of affairs, the British Government in 1905 proposed the appointment of a commission of delegates under the Powers to effect financial reforms. The sultan refused, but the strong pressure of an international fleet at Mitylene caused him to change his mind. Nevertheless, in spite of the intervention of the Powers and better fiscal arrangements, the lawlessness in Macedonia still continued.

Arrangements were being made in 1908 to continue the Financial Commission, when a sudden and successful revolution of the party of "Young Turks" altered the whole political outlook. By secret propaganda and at considerable risk this society had undermined the army. The sultan was forced to yield, and re-establish the constitution of 1876—that constitution which had been such a joke to the diplomats—and amidst great rejoicing the Turkish Parliament solemnly met. The internal weakness of Turkey provided Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria with their opportunity. Austria announced her intention of annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, while Ferdinand proclaimed the independence of Bulgaria and assumed the kingly title. The ball had started to roll. Serbia claimed a slip of Bosnia, Montenegro repudiated the Treaty of Berlin with regard to Antivari, and Crete once more proclaimed her union with Greece. Turkey found herself helpless, and was forced to accept the loss of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a loss which was palliated by the acceptance of an indemnity of £T.2,500,000; she subsequently came to a monetary understanding with Bulgaria, chiefly with regard to compensation for the railways in Eastern Rumelia.

The dissensions of the reformers led to a counter-revolution in Constantinople; but the army at Salonica, chiefly composed of Macedonians, from which city the Young Turks had conducted their operations, remained loyal, and under Shevket Pasha marched on the capital. On 27 April, 1909, Abdul Hamid, the "Red Assassin", was deposed, and his brother Mohammed raised to the throne. The Young Turks remained in undisputed possession; the show of "Liberalism", however, soon waned, and the reformers seemed more anxious for naval and military efficiency, possibly the price of Potsdam gold, than for settling the internal discords of their troubled State.

Rumania during these years of strife has contributed very little to Balkan history. After her heroic deeds round Plevna she was deeply mortified that her splendid services to Russia should be rewarded by the compulsory cession of Bessarabia to that Power in exchange for the Dobrudja, although, of course, Bessarabia had been wrested from Russia after the Crimean campaign. Rumania protested vigorously

against the outrage; but Prince Charles,¹ finding the Powers apathetic, wisely bowed to the inevitable, and took some consolation to himself in the general acknowledgment of Rumanian independence.

In 1881 Prince Charles assumed the kingly dignity, and until his regretted death in 1914 proved himself one of the ablest rulers in Europe. Since becoming a kingdom Rumania has chiefly been interested in social questions, and especially in her Jewish problem. The rapid increase of the Jews in numbers and in wealth alarmed native Rumanians, and several discreditable Anti-Semitic riots took place. In Balkan affairs her object has been to preserve balance of power by playing on the jealousies of Bulgaria and Serbia. Her chief interest lay in the Kutzo-Vlach communities of Macedonia, whom she claimed as kinsmen, and the Hellenizing propaganda of Greece frequently brought her to the verge of a rupture with that State.

During the troubled times subsequent to the "Young Turk" revolution and the events that led to the Balkan League and War, Rumania held aloof; but she interfered after the Conference of London to prevent Bulgaria becoming too powerful at the expense of Serbia and Greece. The unsatisfactory terms of the Peace of Bukarest were dictated by her, moreover she took advantage of the exhaustion of Bulgaria to round off her territory at her expense.

Montenegro, like Rumania, after gaining her independence in 1880, and the rounding off of her territory towards the sea, as the result of her campaign with Serbia, enjoyed until the outbreak of the Balkan War in 1912 a comparatively peaceful existence under the enlightened rule of Prince Nicholas. After establishing excellent relations with Turkey, the prince devoted his attention to the agricultural and commercial needs of his realm. In 1905 he granted parliamentary institutions to his subjects by the founding of the Montenegrin Assembly. The prince added considerably to the prestige of his little kingdom, about the same size as Wales, by allying himself with other Powers by the brilliant marriages of his daughters. In 1910 Nicholas declared himself King of Montenegro, and became a guiding spirit in the foundation of the Balkan League, while on the outbreak of hostilities the first shots of the war were fired by the men of the Black Mountain. At the conclusion of peace, owing to the veto of Austria, he was deprived of the splendid fruit of his army's prowess—Scutari. When Austria declared war on Serbia (July, 1914) the gallant little kingdom at once rushed to the assistance of her sister Slav State; consequently Montenegro is now one of our allies in this tremendous campaign to crush the menace of Prussian militarism.

Let us now pass on to the causes that produced the Balkan War. The deposition of Abdul Hamid was to have produced a golden era of reform for Turkey, but the sinister influence of Pan-Germanism, temporarily set back by the banishment of the potentate whose guilty

¹ Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen

rule it had been instrumental in propping up, soon began to reassert itself over the Young Turks. Turkish Liberalism died stillborn, and militarism, fed on German gold, waxed stronger. The lot of the Christian in Macedonia became harder, while the economic condition of that country grew from worse to worse. Confronted by incorrigible Turkish misrule and Pan-German ambitions in the Near East, in self-defence the Balkan States of Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro sank their age-long differences and formed the Balkan League. Serbia and Montenegro joined the League because they wanted to keep an eye on Austria, Greece and Bulgaria to watch Turkey and incidentally one another. Turkish massacres at Kotchana and Berand started the conflagration, which only required a very small spark to set going. An ultimatum was delivered to Turkey by the four States, and mobilization began at the end of September, 1912; Turkey following suit immediately. The intervention of the Powers having proved unavailing, on 8 October Montenegro declared war and invaded Albania; declarations followed from the other States.

The greatest danger lay in the spreading of the conflagration to the rest of Europe, and the efforts of diplomacy were strained to the utmost to localize the conflict. The combatants were warned that no territorial alterations would be permitted, but the phenomenal success of the Allies and the collapse of Turkey made the carrying out of such a threat upon armies flushed with victory impossible and dangerous to the general peace. Consequently Austrian jealousy of Serbian successes and aims was left to smoulder.

The Greek army, which had been concentrated at Larissa, entering Macedonia by the Melma Pass and the valley of the Xerias River, met the Turks at Elassona, took the town of Serfidje, and, winning the battle of Jenitsa, opened the way to Salonica, which surrendered on 8 November. The Serbs advanced into northern and central Macedonia, through old Serbia, and defeated the Turks at Kumanovo, and afterwards at Prilep and Monastir. The heaviest fighting fell to Bulgaria, who poured her troops into the plains of Thrace, and, after inflicting terrible defeats on the Turks at Kirk Killesse and Lulu Burgas, with a portion of her army laid siege to Adrianople, and with the rest pursued the routed forces of the sultan to the Chataldja lines. The Montenegrins meanwhile laid siege to Scutari and Janina.

The Turks now applied for the mediation of the Powers, which was refused, and application was consequently made to the Allies for an armistice. The Allies demanded the surrender of all the strongholds still being besieged, including the Chataldja lines, thus, but for a small strip of territory round Constantinople, driving the Turks out of Europe. These terms were repudiated by Nazim Pasha. On 29 November a further discussion for an armistice began at Chataldja, and on 3 December a suspension of hostilities, but without the right of re-victualling, was agreed upon, pending the opening of peace negotiations in London on 13 December. The armistice was signed by the other three States, but not by Greece, who by this time was at logger-



PETER I, KING OF SERBIA



FERDINAND I, TSAR (KING) OF
THE BULGARIANS

NAWA. 21. 1. 1918. 5. 1. 1918.



GEORGE I, KING OF THE HELLENES



CAROL I, KING OF RUMANIA

heads with Bulgaria. The delegates of the four Balkan States arrived in London on 13 December; at the same time by mutual arrangement the ambassadors of the Great Powers met in conference, the tension in the Near East still being dangerous; for Austria had mobilized in view of Serbian ambitions towards the Adriatic, and Russia had also partially mobilized to stand by her Slav kinsmen. The German ambassador worked with Sir Edward Grey to effect a settlement, anxious for Germany's Turkish interests as well as those of her Austrian ally. An announcement was issued by the ambassadors on 20 December proclaiming Albanian autonomy, together with a guarantee to Serbia of commercial access to the Adriatic. The Balkan and Turkish delegates meanwhile had several meetings which ended in a deadlock. The Turks steadfastly refused to surrender Adrianople, and negotiations were suspended. Further conversations took place with the ambassadors, and by the end of January the armistice was raised. Hostilities resumed, and Turkish fortunes met with no improvement. Janina fell on 26 March; the Serbians came to the assistance of the Bulgarians round Adrianople, and that fortress surrendered on 6 March; while Scutari's resistance was overcome by the Montenegrins on 23 April.

Now that force of arms had decided outstanding questions, the Turks were glad to sign a treaty in London on 30 May, which provided that beyond a line drawn from Enos, near the mouth of the River Maritza on the Ægean Sea, to Midia on the coast of the Black Sea, all Turkey except Albania should be ceded to the Allies, and further, the Porte agreed to withdraw from Crete. Gallant little Montenegro had to yield to the armed persuasion of an allied fleet of the Powers. She was forced to give up Scutari in the interests of the new Albanian kingdom, which nobody wanted and yet which had to be, in order to preserve peace from the conflicting interests of Austria-Hungary and Italy.

This unfortunate kingdom of Albania, if it preserved a show of balance of power in the Adriatic, completely upset the plans of the Balkan League, and especially those of Serbia. That which Turkish and Pan-German diplomacy had foreseen and worked for came about—the Allies began to quarrel among themselves. The age-long hate of the Bulgar for the Serbian could no longer be restrained—in fact it was impossible to hope for a peaceful solution when once the interests of two such races clashed.

Serbia, balked in her design of expanding westward to the Adriatic, at once sought compensation in central Macedonia; but inasmuch as this territory was allocated by a treaty made previous to the war to Bulgaria, that kingdom at once refused to allow the Serbian claim. That treaty had conceded to Serbia a line starting from Ochrida on the Albanian frontier, and running north-east across the River Vardar, a few miles above Vales, and thence following the same direction to Golema Vreh on the Bulgarian boundary. Owing to the altered aspect of affairs Greece agreed to a boundary with Serbia

starting from Lake Presba, and running eastward between Monastir and Florina to the River Vardar, a little to the south of Ghevegli. This arrangement practically excluded Bulgaria from Central and Western Macedonia.

King Ferdinand, encouraged by Austria, refused to grant the Serbian claim, and, standing by the treaty, requested the withdrawal of the Serbian army from central Macedonia. This request the Serbian Government refused; they asserted their right to compensation in Macedonia to atone for the losses Serbia had sustained in the west, especially taking into consideration the fact that the position was different from what was contemplated at the time when the treaty was drawn up. For Bulgaria had gained rich territory in Thrace; moreover, Serbia had rendered her assistance at Adrianople and had won victories further south than had been stipulated for. The Greeks were only too glad to come to the assistance of Serbia; because for some time they had been quarrelling bitterly with the Bulgarians, the bone of contention being Salonika, which Bulgaria had regarded as her prey and which had fallen into the hands of the Greeks a few days before the Bulgarians could arrive on the scene.

For some time Bulgaria had been hinting at petitioning the Powers for the creation of Salonika as a free port; therefore to stop this game Greece saw that her interest lay with Serbia.

The situation was obviously one for compromise. None displayed this necessary spirit; moreover, the arrogance of King Ferdinand became unbearable. Offers of mediation came from Petrograd which were gratefully accepted by the Serbians, and acquiesced in by the Greeks; but the Bulgarians would give no reply. Then, secretly advised by the Pan-Germans of Vienna and Berlin, with adroit compliments to his invincible army, King Ferdinand suddenly, without preliminary warning, attacked the Greco-Serbian armies. The result was a bitter disappointment to the diplomats of Potsdam, for Ferdinand was decisively beaten, and their plans went still further astray by the action of Rumania—supposed to be Germanophil—who put a veto on further aggression. Bulgaria was forced to sue for peace; terms were arranged at Bukarest by which Serbia and Greece obtained what they wanted, and Bulgaria was even forced to yield some territory to Rumania. The Turks were not likely to let slip the opportunity of a weakened Bulgaria, and that unfortunate kingdom had to submit to the bitter humiliation to her pride in ceding back to the enemy Adrianople and the battle-fields of Kirk Killisse and Lulu Burgas drenched with Bulgarian blood.

The triumph of Serbia was peculiarly galling to Austria-Hungary, who was forced to acknowledge that the despised little State was developing into a leader of Slavdom and menacing her own dominance as a Slav Power. Moreover, Serbia was the protégée of Russia, so her ascendancy was also displeasing to the German Kaiser, who feared that Russian Pan-Slavism would have a ready ally to balk his plans in Turkey. There was constant talk in Vienna and Buda-Pesth, really

directed at Russia, that Serbia must be chastised. The assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his consort at Serajevo, as already narrated, was ascribed to Serbian plotting in Belgrade. There was no evidence for the accusation, and the case was mainly drawn up by a former Austrian Minister in Belgrade, Count von Fosgach, whose hatred of the Slavs was well known. An ultimatum was delivered to Serbia couched in such insolent terms—and terms that must be traced to Potsdam for their origin—that no nation that valued its independence and its honour could accept them. In the words of Mr. Lloyd George: “Serbia faced the situation with dignity. She said to Austria, ‘If any officers of mine have been guilty and are proved to be guilty, I will dismiss them’. Austria said, ‘That is not good enough for me’. It was not guilt she was after, but capacity.”

PART IV

The Latin Nations

CHAPTER XV

THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC

During the closing scenes of France's agony in the disastrous war with Prussia, and the negotiations for peace with an arrogant enemy flushed with the success of victory, Thiers proved himself the wisest, ablest, and the most resourceful Frenchman of his time. He was the very embodiment of patriotism, and after the sacrifices demanded by the humiliating Peace of Frankfort, all parties in the State had to let their differences smoulder, and look to the "grand little old man" for a lead. To Thiers France was above party or faction. He desired a stable government to give her a few years' breathing-space in which to recover from the terrible losses inflicted by the war, and, although a Monarchist by training and conviction, he saw in the Republic the only possible form of government for the moment to which Frenchmen of all shades of thought could rally in the work of regeneration. In his own words, "It is the Republic which divides us least".

The overwhelming debacle of Sedan, the unpopularity of the Empress Eugenie, and the youth of the Prince Imperial made the Bonapartist cause impossible. The only hope of anti-Republicanism lay in the Monarchists, if the Legitimists and Orleanists could settle their feud of half a century; but for the moment the Monarchists preferred to wait, and let Thiers complete his work of liberation.

The first most imperative duty which confronted him was to find the money to pay the huge indemnity exacted by the Germans, and thus free the country from the armies of occupation. On 20 June he obtained from the Assembly a vote for a loan of two and a half milliards at five per cent; and such was the prevailing patriotism that the amount was immediately subscribed twice over; consequently, by 30 September, 1871, Germany received one and a half milliards, and withdrew two-thirds of her army from French territory. A subsequent loan of three milliards in 1872 was subscribed for seven times over, and France was free of her Teuton masters. The next step was to reform the army. Thiers brought in an Army Bill introducing a system of universal con-

scription, and he advocated a five years' service. The proposal was disliked by the Assembly, which preferred a service of three years, and Thiers could only carry his point by a vigorous threat of resignation. With the exception of certain privileged persons—as is also the case in the German army—who by passing a necessary examination need only serve for one year, every citizen was now bound to serve five years with the colours, followed by four years in the reserve and a period with the territorial army. To complete the army reform, a Committee of Defence was formed, who established a network of fortresses and entrenchments, behind which France was to complete her work of consolidation.

Thiers, as the one necessary man, maintained his power for two years, while the Monarchist party, who had tolerated him so long as his work of ridding French territory of the German armies and financial reorganization was incomplete, waited their chance. During 1872 Thiers had been drawing nearer to Gambetta and the Republican party, and had receded from the so-called Pact of Bordeaux, in which it was understood that as President he was merely keeping the king's place warm, by his declaration in the Assembly (13 November, 1872) that it was time to establish the Republic. Standing now confessed as a Republican, and in 1873 the last payment having been made to Berlin, the Monarchists determined on his overthrow by a coalition of Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists. The removal of the moderate M. Jules Grévy from the chair having been accomplished, and an Imperialist, M. Buffet, being elected to the vacancy, an attack was begun on the policy of M. Thiers. The old man defended himself with spirit and dignity, maintaining that a Conservative Republic was necessary to the welfare of France. The Assembly, however, by a majority of 14, passed a resolution to which M. Thiers was unable to subscribe, and he accordingly resigned. The resignation was accepted, and the Assembly proceeded in great haste to elect as President Marshal MacMahon, a soldier of distinction and of royalist opinion.

The victory proved barren for the Monarchists, for they were unable to find a candidate for the throne. The Comte de Paris, the Orleanist claimant, sacrificed himself to the cause of royalty, and acknowledged the "Legitimist" Comte de Chambord as rightful king of France. But the Comte de Chambord refused to budge from a single tenet of his belief in the "divine right", and would give no guarantees as to his future rule. Further, he refused to acknowledge the "tricolour" as the national flag, and, in addition to restoring the old white flag of his ancestors, promised to strive for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The discomfiture of the reactionaries was complete, and the policy of Thiers stood justified. Everywhere the elections went in favour of the Republicans, while early in the year the hopes of the Bonapartists had been dashed by the death of Napoleon III at Chislehurst, leaving an only son, the Prince Imperial, of too tender years to inspire a cause. There was only one way out of the impasse, to continue the truce that Thiers had aimed at; therefore the Assembly,




LOUIS ADOLPHE THIERS



MARSHAL MACMAHON

From photographs by Pierre Petit

NAWAL SALAH J. NG BAHRIKH.



JULES GRÉVY

From a photograph by Pierre Petit



SADI CARNOT

From a photograph

on 19 November, 1873, passed a Bill confiding the Presidency to Marshal MacMahon for seven years, and a committee was appointed to draw up a constitution, which received, paradoxically enough, some support from the Monarchists, who were alarmed by signs of Bonapartist progress in the provinces. It was a case of any combination to prevent a Bonapartist from getting in. In 1875 the law of the Republican Constitution was passed, and provided for two Assemblies—the Chamber of Deputies, elected by universal suffrage, and the Senate, elected by the Departments. Senators hold their seats for nine years, deputies for four. The President is elected by a united session of both Assemblies, retains his office for seven years, and is eligible for re-election. He is irresponsible except for high treason; can propose laws concurrently with the members of the two Chambers, and promulgate them when made. Further, the President has the right to dissolve, on the approval of the Senate, the House of Deputies; is head of the army and navy, and can exercise the royal prerogative of pardon. Moreover, he is the chief of the *corps diplomatique*, and may, under certain safeguards, ratify treaties.

In 1877 the Clericals and Monarchists, alarmed at the advance of extreme Republican opinions throughout the country, attempted a diversion by raising the cry of restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, a proceeding which drew the newly-formed kingdom of Italy towards Germany. Owing to the pressure of Gambetta and his followers, the Premier, M. Jules Simon, was forced to adopt an anti-Clerical resolution. This was the opportunity which the Clerico-Monarchists had been seeking. President MacMahon was persuaded to dismiss the Ministry of Jules Simon, and the Duc de Broglie formed an anti-Republican Cabinet. The result, however, of the manœuvre was not encouraging, as the Republicans by a strong majority denounced their enemies. MacMahon then dissolved the Chamber, but the rout of the Monarchists was complete; in spite of their efforts to manipulate the elections, a Republican triumph was the result. Moreover, their discomfiture was added to by the death of Thiers and the political impetus gained by their rivals in the well-staged public funeral of the Liberator.

MacMahon refused to resort to a *coup d'état* in favour of the Comte de Chambord, and the danger of a military dictatorship was averted by the moderate Republican Ministry of M. Dufaure, who was recalled after the resignation of the Duc de Broglie and the abortive Cabinet of General de Rochonnet. M. Dufaure's Ministry lasted the rest of the term of Marshal MacMahon's presidency.

The most important event of MacMahon's presidency from the Continental point of view was undoubtedly the enlarging and re-organizing of the army in 1875 by adding a fourth battalion to each regiment. The marvellous recuperation of the French from their losses, and this extraordinary show of military activity, caused alarm at Berlin, as has already been narrated in the section on the German Empire. It was supposed that France was preparing for an immediate war of revenge, and Bismarck delivered a reprimand to the

French Ministry that almost amounted to an ultimatum. But Queen Victoria and the Emperor Alexander II intervened, "and, within a short time, such a chorus of international condemnation was heard that, however Bismarck might have been intending to act, he was now compelled to declare that Germany had no thought of making a war of aggression on France".¹ This event marks the beginning of German Anglophobia, and the gradual drawing together of the bonds that unite Russia and France.

In the final year of his presidency MacMahon had the gratification of presiding at the opening of the Exhibition of 1878, when he charmed all parties by his dignity and his tact. The exhibition was financially a failure, but as an advertisement to the world of the recuperation of France from the disasters of 1870 and 1871, and of her intellectual and industrial grandeur, it achieved its object. MacMahon having by now recognized the strength of the Republican position, especially in the elections to the Chamber of Deputies in January, was glad—by refusing to impeach certain generals for illegal acts in the election of 1877, who he considered had only followed his own instructions—to find an excuse for resigning his office, whereupon he was succeeded by the Republican, M. Jules Grévy.

The election of Grévy, who was a barrister with a solid reputation, marked the complete triumph of the Democratic Republicans. The new President appointed M. Waddington as Prime Minister, and Gambetta became President of the Chamber, which was a position less than his talents and services entitled him to. The most conspicuous member of the new Cabinet was M. Jules Ferry, who immediately, as Minister for Education, started on an anti-Clerical campaign, in revenge for the plot of *Seize Mai*. Ferry's object was to attack the ultramontanes while remaining on friendly terms with the mass of Catholics. His chief enmity was directed against the Orders; he had very little against the parish priests. An educational Bill was introduced containing a clause to forbid the right of imparting instruction to any congregation that had not received State recognition. This Bill was, of course, aimed at the Jesuits. Although only intended as a mild beginning to a larger scheme, Jules Ferry's measure caused intense feeling, and Waddington, the Premier, resigned. He was succeeded by de Freycinet, who only gave the Bill a half-hearted support before it was thrown out by the Senate. De Freycinet was compelled by the Chamber to promulgate two decrees (20 March, 1880) expelling the Jesuits and requiring the congregations practically to register themselves with the State. Suspected of secret treating with the Vatican, de Freycinet was deposed by the Republicans, and Jules Ferry was called to the presidency of the Council. Ferry promptly obtained his object: a vote was passed ordering the closing of the houses of the religious Orders, but as this enactment did not imply dissolution the Orders were only shorn of some of their power. The Government then proceeded to pass laws for the benefit of popular education by which primary education became

¹ Frederick Lawton's *The Third French Republic*, p. 77.

compulsory, and undertook to be responsible for the provision of teachers and their salaries. Normal schools at St. Cloud and Fontenay were established for this purpose of training teachers, who were mostly children of the people.

During the Ministry of Ferry (1883-5) the French obtained important colonial gains—Tunis, and an extension of their sphere of influence in Indo-China. The acquisition of Tunis was the direct result of Lord Salisbury's invitation at the Congress of Berlin, 1878, to occupy that territory, and the further tacit consent given by Bismarck to such a proceeding. But there was something sinister in the Iron Chancellor's invitation; from his point of view it was a diplomatic coup, since Tunis estranged Italy from France and threw the Italians into the Triple Alliance. "The estrangement of France and Italy postponed at any rate for a whole generation, possibly for the present age, that war of revenge in which, up to the spring of 1881, the French might easily have gained the help of Italy."¹

The pillaging expeditions of the tribes of the Krunnis was the direct cause of French interference in Tunis. By the Treaty of Bardo (May, 1881) the Bey of Tunis recognized the suzerainty of the Republic, and an expedition was sent out under the command of General Saussier. This expedition was anything but popular with the French public, and Ferry exercised the greatest caution and secrecy in the undertaking. Even the announcement of the taking of Kairwan was received with mixed feelings, and the party of the Extreme Left were bitter in their opposition to his policy. However, time has justified the material aspect of Ferry's acquisition, even if the diplomacy was at the moment unsound; for Tunis has proved a most valuable and profitable investment for the Republic.

The French sovereignty in Cochin-China had been acknowledged by the Emperor of Annam in a vague treaty (15 March, 1875), consequent to the brilliant explorations by Garnier of the Mekong; but a certain commandant, Rivière, while on an expedition to Hanoi in defence of French traders, having met his death in an ambushade, Ferry sent Admiral Courbet to obtain a proper acknowledgment of the French protectorate from the Emperor of Annam, and to obtain the delta of Tonking from the tribe of the Black Flags. The admiral captured the forts at the mouth of the River Hue, and, after further French successes, China signed a treaty relinquishing Tonking. But scarcely had this arrangement been signed when Colonel Duchesne, who was on his way to occupy Langson, was treacherously attacked by the Chinese in the Bac-le Pass. Admiral Courbet was at once ordered to take vengeance, and destroyed (23 August, 1884) the arsenal of Foi-Chow. Formosa, Kelung, and the Pescadores islands were then taken, and Chinese trade was blockaded. The Chinese were beginning to retire, and diplomatic negotiations were proceeding, when the French suffered some unexpected reverses at Bang-Co and Langson. These reverses caused intense feeling in Paris, and resulted in the over-

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Development of the European Nations*, p. 329.

throw of the Ministry of Jules Ferry. They proved, however, to have been exaggerated; the blockade by Admiral Courbet had done its work, and China was glad to sign a peace at Tientsin, 9 June, 1885. The result to the French was the acknowledgment of their protectorate in Tonking and Annam, and a sphere of influence in the province of Yunnan.

To the credit of Jules Ferry must also be placed a modification of the constitution. Both Chambers met together and decreed that the Republican form of government could never be held by a member of any of the families which had reigned in France; further, the Senate was reformed, and the system of nominating senators was abolished, also the electoral system of *scrutin de liste* was established. After the resignation of Ferry, M. Henri Brisson was appointed Prime Minister. Brisson was a lawyer and journalist of simple and honest character, with great devotion to the Republic, and he formed his Cabinet from all the Republican groups against their common enemies, the Clerico-Monarchists. The combination held together until, on the termination of the Chamber's quadrennium in 1885, a new parliamentary election had to be held. The election, which was the first held by the *scrutin de liste*, ended in a complete surprise, as the Monarchists polled nearly half the votes. This recrudescence of Monarchism was partly due to popular discontent and partly to the dislike and suspicion of the Moderates for the revolutionary character of the Radical programme. The Republicans were divided into the Opportunists, who favoured the views of Gambetta, and the Radicals; so Brisson found himself without a working majority, many of his former supporters disagreeing with him on his refusal to undo the policy of Jules Ferry with regard to the Tonking campaign. Brisson decided to make the best of the position as it stood; but, on receiving a merely nominal support from the Chamber in this policy, he tendered his resignation. The fall of the Brisson Ministry coincided with the election for a President; but, alarmed by the advance made by the Monarchists, the various groups of the Republicans combined to re-elect Jules Grévy for a further period. Meanwhile, M. de Freycinet became Premier for the third time, with General Boulanger as Minister of War. The Ministry at once began to take steps to fortify the Republic from the attacks of the Monarchists. Since the death of the childless Comte de Chambord in 1883 the Comte de Paris had been recognized by Legitimists and Orleanists as the rightful heir to the throne, and had continued to live in Paris or at his country residence, the Château d'Eu. But the festivities held on a regal scale by the Count on the occasion of the marriage of his daughter, Princess Amélie, to the Crown Prince of Portugal—festivities which were attended by the whole of Parisian society, and which had greatly excited the populace—added to the alarm of the supporters of the Republic. The Chambers were induced by the Government to vote for the immediate banishment from France of the heads of the Orleanist and Bonapartist factions, together with their eldest sons, and further to deprive their collateral descendants of

rank and dignity under the Republic. Consequently the names of all princes of the Orleans and Bonaparte houses were removed from the Army List.

About this time General Boulanger, the War Minister, began to dazzle the public imagination. He had enjoyed a particularly brilliant military career in the Kabyl-land and Indo-China campaigns, and had shown such conspicuous ability at the War Office during the Franco-Prussian War as to be described by Gambetta as one of the four best officers in France.

Boulanger had owed some advancement to the Duc d'Aumale, and it fell to his lot to have to carry out the sentence of exile against his former benefactor, but this he did, in spite of the overflowing gratitude he had expressed in his former correspondence with the Duke, in the haughtiest and most cynical manner possible. Boulanger was possessed of tireless energy, and by ingratiating himself with the soldiers and the proletariat, elevated himself into the position of a popular hero. At the review held on 14 July to celebrate the fall of the Bastille, the General on his prancing black charger eclipsed all the other notables, and was escorted back to the War Office by an acclaiming crowd. Meanwhile M. de Freycinet fell in an effort to save the sub-prefects, and M. Goblet, an Amiens lawyer, succeeded him. In taking over the Cabinet M. Goblet had to retain Boulanger at the War Office. Boulanger was by now becoming the centre of a definite movement; his reputation was boomed at home and abroad to such an extent that the great Bismarck even gave him sufficient attention to make a military demonstration on the frontier.

Early in 1887 occurred the inconvenient Schnaebeler episode. M. Schnaebeler was arrested at Metz as a spy, and the French Government immediately demanded an enquiry. But among Schnaebeler's papers was a letter of appointment from the German frontier commissary, which amounted to a safe conduct and made the Frenchman's arrest illegal. Bismarck, on the French Ambassador's protest, released Schnaebeler, after accusing him of indulging in suspicious correspondence. There, thanks to the moderation of the French Government, the episode might have ended; but Boulanger seized on it to increase his popularity with the mob. He made a speech against Germany filled with the fiercest chauvinism, and in the spring announced a mobilization of the forces to take place in the autumn on the west and south of France. The Moderate men in the Government took alarm, and limited the army credits which the Premier demanded; whereupon, probably glad to find an excuse to be rid of such a popular and inconvenient colleague, M. Goblet resigned. A Ministry was with difficulty formed under the Opportunist, M. Rouvier; and General Boulanger was left out of the Cabinet. The rage of the populace at this slight to their hero was expressed by the tremendous ovation which was accorded to the General at the railway station, on his departure to take up the command to which he had been appointed at Clermont-Ferrand.

The anti-Republicans determined to use the General's popularity to

strike a blow to overcome the Republic; and money was even subscribed by the Comte de Paris, in spite of Boulanger's infamous treatment of the Duc d'Aumale. But he was more especially under the wing of the Bonapartist party, who persuaded him to stand as a plebiscitary candidate for the presidency.

A grave presidential crisis added to the danger of the moment, owing to the scandal caused by the discovery that M. Grévy's son-in-law, M. Wilson, had been selling Government honours from the Élysée. The existence of a secret agency kept by Wilson, General Caffarel, a staff officer of the War Office, and a woman named Limouzin was brought to light. The evidence against Wilson was indisputable; but President Grévy, in spite of the refusal of his colleagues to form a Ministry, clung to office, and his resignation had literally to be forced from him. This event brought great discredit to the Republic both at home and abroad; and had Boulanger possessed the requisite courage he might have declared himself Dictator, especially during the unedifying period in which M. Grévy was having his mind made up for him.

Three candidates stood out prominently for the vacant presidency: Jules Ferry, de Freycinet, and Floquet. The Monarchists, being without a candidate, favoured Ferry; but M. Clemenceau, fearing the success of Ferry, united the Radicals and persuaded them to vote for an outsider in the person of M. Sadi Carnot, who was subsequently elected by a large majority. The new President entrusted the formation of a Ministry to M. Tirard. The position for the Government became exceedingly unpleasant: the Wilson scandal, slowly dragging out its course in the law courts, was not adding to the popularity of the Republic, moreover the Boulangists were growing more active, in spite of the fact that the General had been deprived of his command for returning to Paris without leave. Both in Paris and the country the General's astounding popularity was increasing by leaps and bounds; he was the idol of the masses and, further, was showered with gifts from private donors; in fact he was regarded as the destined saviour of the country and the avenger of the defeat of 1870-1. Deprived of his command he was promptly hailed as a parliamentary candidate, and in January, 1889, was returned to the Chamber as member for the department of the Seine by an overwhelming majority, which clearly showed that he carried Paris with him. The General was now at the height of his fortunes, and his hour had come for action. He might have overturned the Republic on the very night of his election, and dictated what terms he liked. But once more he refused to seize his opportunity, and his hour had passed. M. Carnot formed a new Cabinet, and again M. Tirard became Premier. It was necessary to pursue a moderate course in order to ensure the success of the Centenary Exhibition to be held that year; but M. Carnot found an admirable Minister of the Interior, who would stand no nonsense, in M. Constans. It became evident to M. Constans that street manifestations¹ were at the root of Boulangism; these he checked, and next directed his attention to the

¹ Frederick Lawton's *The Third French Republic*, p. 125.

quashing of the Patriotic League, which, originally republican in its tone, had now developed into an advertising agency for General Boulanger. The opportunity was found in the inflammatory language used by the League on the occasion of the misunderstanding with Russia over the proselytizing efforts on behalf of the Greek Church made by Atchinoff in Abyssinia in the French territory of Obock. A prosecution of the League was decided upon, and a bitter debate took place in the Chamber. Boulanger took no part in the proceedings, but contented himself with a fiery speech at Tours by which he hoped to draw the Catholic Conservatives. His name was included in the impeachment of the League, but, to the amazement of the whole world, the idol of the Parisian mob, and the tool of the Monarchists, refused to face his trial and fled to Brussels. The Boulangist movement was over, and the General vanished from the public sight. He was convicted in his absence, and a few months later committed suicide over the grave of his mistress in a Brussels cemetery.

The Exhibition of 1889 had been a great success, and had contributed to a rehabilitation of the Republic. The Monarchists by flirting with Boulangism had ruined their cause; consequently in the elections of 1889, held under a new law restoring single-member constituencies and forbidding a candidate to be elected for more than one seat, their vote was decreased to 21 per cent of the poll. Previous to the election the Legislature had passed a Bill reducing the military service from five years to three. A period of calm set in, which was only ruffled by the fantastic appearance of the young Duke of Orleans, who, breaking his exile, came to Paris in an endeavour to claim his right to serve his time in the army. He was sentenced at a police court to two years' imprisonment, but after a few months' incarceration was liberated by President Carnot. This little episode was but as a ripple compared with the storm that was to come—the Panama scandals.

After the successful completion of the Suez Canal, de Lesseps turned his attention towards the Isthmus of Panama, to fulfil a dream of centuries, the connecting of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by a canal. A company was formed in 1882, and the national imagination was stirred by the splendour of the project; the capital of fifty millions being almost all subscribed out of the hard-earned savings of the thrifty peasantry. The difficulties of the undertaking, chiefly owing to the unhealthiness of the climate, proved almost insurmountable. By 1888 the company's capital had been practically absorbed, and payment of interest had to be suspended. An attempt was made to form a new company, carrying on the old one with an additional capital of one million sterling, but de Lesseps, now old and feeble, refused to have anything to do with it. Meanwhile rumours, circulated in the United States and France, became rife as to the scandalous mismanagement of the company's resources, and accusations of corruption against people in high places became too prevalent to pass unnoticed. The company was already in liquidation, when at last, in November, 1892, the Government announced that prosecutions would be instituted against four of the directors and


one contractor. Then accusations were hurled at Monsieur Floquet, the President of the Chamber, who admitted that he had instructed the distribution of 300,000 francs in aid of a press campaign for the company's benefit, but he denied having received any money himself. The matter was not allowed to rest at this explanation, a distinct charge of wholesale bribery was made; the majority had been purchased by a bribe of 3,000,000 francs through a Jewish financier who had recently committed suicide. The gauntlet had been thrown down, and the Government was bound to pick it up. A Special Parliamentary Commission was instituted to investigate the charge, when the lamentable facts came to light that members of both Chambers had been bribed, and that 83,000,000 francs had been spent in floating the loan.

The trials took place early in 1893, and the two de Lesseps were sentenced to terms of imprisonment, though the sentence was remitted in the case of the father in consideration of his great age and infirmities. The other directors were also punished by imprisonment and fines. It was difficult to bring their guilt home to the politicians, but two scapegoats were found in M. Baihaut and M. Blondin. The revelations of the Panama scandals dealt a serious blow to the prestige of the Republic, and the mud that had been flung broadcast ruined the hopes and careers of many politicians. But, thanks to the incompetence of the Monarchists, who seemed to possess no other weapons than invective, the Republican ship emerged from the storm battered but still afloat. Several changes of Ministers followed, of whom the most interesting was M. Casimir-Perier; however, his Ministry only lasted a few months, and M. Dupuy became Premier for the second time. On 23 June, 1894, President Carnot, to the universal horror, was assassinated at Lyons by an anarchist. Although not a brilliant administrator he had sustained his high office with great dignity, and had set an example of blameless conduct in a corrupt period. Possibly it may be due to his qualities that during his presidency the relations between the Catholic Church and the Republic grew more pacific; for ever since its foundation in 1871 the Republic had met with its only formidable adversaries in the militant Catholics who sided with the Monarchists, and their activity during the MacMahon presidency has already been noted. Reprisals were taken by Jules Ferry by the institution of secular education and the expulsion of the Jesuits. The ultramontanes, strongly backed by the Jesuits, rendered tit for tat by giving their support to Boulangism; but on Boulangism ending in a cloud of ridicule the moment was ripe for a *rapprochement*. Cardinal Lavigerie, who became the intermediary between the earnest Catholic Republicans and Pope Leo XIII, in 1890 made a dramatic attempt to reconcile the Republic with the Church. He invited the officers of the Mediterranean squadron to lunch at Algiers, and practically threw over the Monarchist party by proposing the toast of the Republic, and at the close of the function allowing his private band to play the "Marseillaise". Leo XIII followed in 1892—at an opportune moment when the rise of the new Socialist party, "made in Germany", was beginning to alarm sober-minded



JEAN PAUL PIERRE CASIMIR-PÉRIER

From a photograph by Pierre Petit



FÉLIX FAURE

From a photograph



ÉMILE LOUBET

From a photograph by Pierre Petit



ARMAND FALLIÈRES

From a photograph by W. S. Stuart

democrats—with an encyclical *Inter innumeras* by which French Catholics were urged to rally to the Republic. To this M. Loubet, who had become Premier, replied with a promise of toleration. A further letter from the Pope to the French cardinals secured the loyalty of the Royalists led by M. de Mun, who formed a new party called the *Ralliés*. The immediate effect of this truce was that in the election of 1893 the Republicans dropped their anti-Clerical programme, and the demand for the separation of Church and State was shelved for future use.

After the death of Carnot a strong candidate for the presidency was found in M. Casimir-Perier, and he was accordingly elected on 27 June, 1894. The new President bore an honoured name in French annals, and high hopes were held for his regime, but to the universal astonishment M. Casimir-Perier resigned his office within seven months, seizing the pretext of the overthrow of the Dupuy Ministry. From the beginning of his tenure the President had been violently and scurrilously attacked by the Socialists, to whose principles he was an avowed and determined enemy. Finding that he was unable to obtain adequate support from the Republicans, and confronted with the choice of ruling with a Radical Cabinet or of dissolving Parliament, he preferred the joys of private life. But the real reason for the President's resignation probably lay in his distaste for the office: "he consented to assume the chief magistracy under circumstances that would have made a refusal cowardly, and he laid it down again as soon as he discovered he could not conscientiously hold it longer".¹

The unexpected resignation of Casimir-Perier found the political wire-pullers without a candidate. Three names were proposed: Brisson, Waldeck Rousseau, and Félix Faure, a moderate Republican. It was the preponderance of the Moderate vote which eventually brought M. Faure to the Élysée. M. Faure, although of humble origin, was a successful man of business, of distinguished appearance and polished manners, which allowed him to pontificate admirably on public occasions. His first Prime Minister, as was to be expected, was a Moderate, M. Ribot, whose only outstanding appointment was that of M. Hanotaux to the Foreign Office. The Ribot Ministry lasted till the autumn of 1895, when it gave way to a Radical administration under M. Léon Bourgeois, who made a clean sweep and constituted his Cabinet from new men. The main efforts of M. Bourgeois were directed towards the reform of taxation by the introduction of an Income Tax. But such a tax is foreign to French genius; and on the Senate falling foul of Ribot's fiscal scheme, he fell, to make room for M. Méline for the second time, while M. Hanotaux returned to the Foreign Office. The Duc d'Orléans seized the opportunity to issue a manifesto, which fell ludicrously flat.

The most considerable event of Félix Faure's presidency was the cementing of the Franco-Russian alliance, which, originating under Alexander III, was renewed, with warm assurances of friendship, by

¹ Frederick Lawton's *The Third French Republic*, pp. 161, 162.

his son, Nicholas II. In October, 1896, the Emperor Nicholas, accompanied by the Empress, paid a State visit to Paris. The entertainments and display in honour of the Imperial couple were on an unprecedented scale of lavishness and magnificence, while the expressions of goodwill uttered by the Emperor left little doubt as to the solidity of the alliance. The return visit was made by the President, who was accompanied by M. Hanotaux, the Foreign Minister, to the Russian Court in August of the following year, when the Emperor received M. Faure with almost royal honours, and endeavoured to rival the magnificence of his own reception at Paris.

M. Méline's premiership of over two years, an unprecedented length of life for French politics, came to an end in June, 1898, and the short-lived Ministry of M. Brisson took its place. This administration was chiefly remarkable for the rise of a new political party composed of malcontents with the Republic of all political shades, which under its leader, Édouard Drumont, became mainly anti-Semitic in policy. M. Brisson held office till the adjournment for the autumn session, when M. Dupuy became Premier for the third time. On 16 February, 1899, M. Félix Faure died under somewhat tragic circumstances from a sudden attack of apoplexy. During his last years at the Élysée he had lost his popularity owing to his pomposity and love of ostentation, but the soundness of his foreign policy has left him with a claim to the gratitude of Frenchmen. M. Félix Faure had clung tenaciously to office; so there was no candidate prepared for a presidential campaign. The choice of the Congress then fell upon M. Loubet, the President of the Senate, a politician of sound views, who had held the portfolios of Public Works and of the Interior, and who in 1892 became Prime Minister.

The mention above of M. Drumont affords us an excuse for retracing our steps to discuss the extraordinary war of anti-Semitism which permeated France subsequent to the fiasco of Boulangism, and which found its focus in the sordid Dreyfus affair. M. Drumont was the editor of the *Libre Parole* and author of the work *La France Juive*, in which he sought to disclose the immense influence of Jewry upon the State with its powerful backing of Jewish financiers. The Jews, it was alleged, were the enemies of French nationalism and of Catholic Christianity. The *Libre Parole*, in reality of anti-capitalistic views, obtained the backing of the Catholics and the so-called "Nationalist" party by its accusation of a conspiracy between the Jews, the Freemasons, and the Socialists to direct the anti-religious policy of the Republic. The great cry of this anti-Semitic movement was the danger to the army from baleful and non-patriotic Jewish influence.

In October, 1894, the *Libre Parole* announced a case of Jewish treason in the person of a Jewish captain of artillery, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, who had been found guilty by court martial of selling French military secrets, and who was consequently deprived of his military rank and sentenced to imprisonment for life in a fortress. There was no direct proof of the captain's guilt, and the prosecution obtained their verdict

on the similarity of the suspect's handwriting to that in a *bordereau* or covering letter containing a list of the documents treasonably communicated. The trial had been held behind closed doors, and the first part of the sentence—that of the military degradation—was carried out on 5 January, 1895. A month later the Chamber of Deputies passed a special law to authorize his deportation to the Île du Diable, off the coast of French Guiana. The secrecy of the trial, quite in accordance with French usage, would not have attracted attention but for the agitation got up by the captain's co-religionists, who asserted his innocence, the inadequacy of proof, and the irregularity of his trial. The anti-Semitic element in the War Office maintained the prisoner's guilt, the question concerning which, it was stated, would not have been raised had he been a Gentile.

Suddenly in May, 1898, Lieutenant-Colonel Picquart, the head of the Intelligence Department, received a *petit-bleu* or post card, torn in pieces under similar circumstances to the now famous *bordereau*. On being pieced together it was found to bear the name and address of Major Esterhazy. Picquart made enquiries about Esterhazy, whose life was found to be irregular and dissipated. He then looked into the *dossier* of the case, and found that the rather vague documents might be as applicable to Esterhazy as to Dreyfus. The War Office found Picquart inconvenient, so General Boisdeffre sent him on a mission to Tripoli, and Colonel Henry was placed at the head of the Intelligence Department.

While on his mission Picquart received threatening letters from Henry accusing him of improper interference in the Dreyfus matter. Picquart, in June, 1897, through his lawyers, laid his case before M. Scheurer-Kestner, Vice-President of the Senate, who tried to obtain a fresh enquiry, being convinced of the innocence of Captain Dreyfus. But M. Méline, the Prime Minister, refused, saying that it was impossible to go behind the judgment of the court; that the Dreyfus affair no longer existed. As a matter of fact, the Dreyfus case had just begun; it became a national matter, and France was sharply divided into Dreyfusards and anti-Dreyfusards. In the words of the late Mr. G. W. Steevens: "The battle for and against Dreyfus went on with ever-increasing savagery. It engrossed the whole of politics, and spread chaos into every province of private life. The French press, never distinguished for moderation in controversy, became violent and malignant beyond all parallel. No abuse was too foul or too absurd to be showered on somebody who thought differently about Dreyfus. . . . The lines of party vanished, and men who had been friends for half a generation now cut one another."¹

It is to be regretted that the affair took on all the virus of a religious controversy of the Middle Ages. The Clericals—but not Catholics of moderate opinion it must be remembered—ranged themselves with the army, under the title of "national", against Jews, Protestants, and Radicals, who were thought to be the enemies of France. It may

¹ G. W. Steevens's *The Tragedy of Dreyfus*, p. 10.


be offered in extenuation for the Méline Ministry that it was obsessed by the threat of Socialism. But the whole sting of the question to French patriotism lay in the slur cast upon the honour of the army, which was the one essentially national institution above the clash of parties—and the flame of indignation against this imputation was well fanned by the ultramontanes.

To stem the tide was impossible; the friends of Dreyfus increased in number and influence, and the day came when an enquiry had to be ordered upon the Esterhazy accusation. Space prevents us from dwelling on the amazing tale of intrigue unfolded during the Esterhazy court martial. Esterhazy's accusation against Picquart, in which the mysterious "veiled lady" bears a prominent part, was, to say the least, wildly improbable; but nevertheless the tale was believed by the court martial; he was acquitted, and on the same day Picquart, the inconvenient, was arrested for tampering with professional documents. Then Zola, emerging from his prosaic life, published his famous letter *J'accuse*, full of violent accusations of everyone concerned in the condemnation of Dreyfus. Civil proceedings were taken against the famous novelist, and after two trials he was condemned, but escaped into exile.

The triumph of the anti-Dreyfusards was complete; at the election of 1898 they obtained a majority, even though M. Méline had to make way for the Radical, M. Brisson. The new War Minister, M. Cavaignac, in a speech of dramatic interest in the Chamber on 7 July, professed to lay before the house, taking it into his confidence as it were, fresh proofs of the guilt of Dreyfus, comprised in three letters between the German military attaché, Schwarzkoppen, and the Italian attaché, Panizzardi. Cavaignac's speech was acclaimed to the skies, and the Chamber ordered it to be posted upon the walls of every commune.

Two days later Picquart, in an open letter to the Premier, denounced two of the letters as having nothing to do with Dreyfus, and the third he declared was a forgery. The gallant Picquart was right. Within a few weeks Colonel Henry, who had superseded him at the Intelligence Office, confessed to having forged the new evidence, and committed suicide in his cell.

Such a startling revelation made the position of the anti-Dreyfusards impossible; resignations from the army followed on a wholesale scale, and M. Cavaignac himself relinquished his portfolio. The case was referred to the *Cour de Cassation*; but even then the anti-Dreyfusards made an effort to prevent the case being retried. They pushed a law through the Chamber transferring the case from the Criminal Chamber of the Court to the full Court of the three divisions, in the hope of obtaining a majority of the judges. The united Chambers sat to hear evidence between 24 and 29 April, and after the deposition of an unheard-of number of witnesses, and sifting the matter to the very bottom, the Court quashed the Convention of 1894, and ordered a new court martial to take place at Rennes. This decision, prompted as it was by the barest necessities of justice, shattered the ranks of the anti-Dreyfusards,



THE THIRD TRIAL OF CAPTAIN DREYFUS

The prisoner before the Court Martial at Rennes

From a drawing by S. Begg

and an attack was made the next day at Auteuil races on M. Loubet. The Ministry of Dupuy fell; a mixed Cabinet was formed by the able M. Waldeck Rousseau, which included even Socialists and a military martinet and aristocrat, the Marquis de Gallifet. Meanwhile matters fared badly with the original accusers of Dreyfus. Du Paty du Clam was arrested; Esterhazy, now in exile, confessed his forgery of the *Bordereau*. Picquart was released, and Zola returned triumphant from Switzerland.

The new trial of Dreyfus began at Rennes on 7 August, and was held in public before seven judges. His old accusers, especially General Mercier, were as emphatic as ever in their belief of his guilt, but their evidence rested on verbal accusations, and amounted, in fact, to the statement that Dreyfus must have betrayed the documents because, owing to his position at the Intelligence Office, he was the most likely person to have done so. Such reasoning was exposed to the scathing logic of the prisoner's counsel, Maître Labori—who during the trial was the victim of a foul attempt on his life—and Maître Demange. Nevertheless the judges, by five to two, found him guilty, with an astonishing rider stating extenuating circumstances. The luckless Dreyfus was condemned to ten years' penal servitude; but the Cabinet, to get out of an awkward dilemma, advised the President to accord the prisoner a full pardon. Such was the unsatisfactory result of the most amazing miscarriage of justice of modern times. Broken in health Dreyfus was glad to accept the pardon, in the hope that when quieter times prevailed he would be able to rehabilitate completely his innocence.

The passion that prevailed over the innocence or guilt of a captain of artillery is hard for the sober British mind to understand; but the position becomes clearer when the fact is grasped that Dreyfus was a mere pawn in conflicting political views. Against Dreyfus were ranged the forces of anti-republicanism, and consequently the political situation developed into a fight for the safety of the Republic. In fact, on the day of President Faure's funeral an attempt was made by M. Déroulède, a champion of a plebiscitary republic, and Marcel Hubert to induce General Roget, who was leading his troops back to barracks, to turn them against the Élysée and overthrow the Republic by evicting the newly-elected President. The general refused, and the two conspirators found themselves in prison. Later, Déroulède, Hubert, Buffet, and Jules Guérin, with many other Royalists, were tried before the High Court for conspiracy against the Republic.

The arrest of Jules Guérin caused considerable excitement in Paris mingled with some amusement, for the leader of the anti-Semitic League fortified himself in the head-quarters of the League in the Rue Chabrol, defied the authorities to do their worst for several weeks, and only succumbed on a show of military force. The trials of the chief conspirators took place in the new year, and varying terms of banishment were pronounced against them. The result of the trial gave the *coup de grace* to Monarchist pretensions, and especially to those of the

Duc d'Orléans. On this, as on other occasions, the Royalist party had shown itself unfit to lead.

M. Waldeck Rousseau proved himself the strongest premier the Third Republic had produced, and his administrators became known as the Ministry for the "Defence of the Republic", such a title of course implying offensive measures against her enemies, the forces of ultra-montanism. The regrettable war between Church and State had begun. The trouble arose from the alleged attempt of the "nationalists", who were largely Clericals, to obtain control of the army, the chief officers of the army during the Dreyfus agitation having been "nationalist". M. Waldeck Rousseau saw that the strength of the Clerical campaign lay in the teaching orders, and in 1900 brought in a bill directed against them. Although according to the law all associations, religious included, which contained more than twenty members were bound to receive the authorization of the Government, the religious Orders had managed to evade this enactment and had increased and multiplied hugely, with the result that their system of education was swamping that of the State. The new Bill required all Orders to obtain permission to teach, and further the constitution of each Order was bound to receive Government approval, nor could any member of an unauthorized Order obtain the position of a teacher in a school.

M. Waldeck Rousseau denied any attempt at persecution in reply to the indignant objections of Catholics of all shades, and promised a thorough examination of each case. Four Orders, the Jesuits, Benedictines, Carmelites, and Assumptionists, refused to comply with the Government's demands and were accordingly proscribed.

Unfortunately, failing health forced M. Waldeck Rousseau to resign his office in 1902 and hand his ecclesiastical policy over to M. Combes, who proved himself a merciless opponent and ultra-rabid partisan. The new Premier began to interpret the Religious Order Act in ruthless fashion, and several institutions which had been opened as Associations, with a view to obtaining legal authority, were closed. Combes, not satisfied with this, directed his attention to the suppression of the Orders themselves, and in 1903 secured the expulsion of the Carthusians, using an unworthy quibble of the discovery of some hostile writings, attributed to the fathers, in their monasteries. The blow next descended upon all the Religious Orders, who were deprived of their right to teach or preach, and it was not long before the turn of the secular clergy came.

The death of the aged Leo XIII put an end to the conciliatory attitude of the Vatican. His successor, Pius X, was little versed in the ways of diplomacy, but was a doughty champion of ecclesiastical rights.

M. Combes began to question the right of the Pope to appoint bishops who had not received the approval of the State; in other words, the appointment of bishops should lie with the State. Pius X promptly directed a strongly-worded protest against the irreligious policy of France. The occasion of the visit of M. Loubet to Victor Emmanuel at the Quirinal in April, 1904, widened still further the breach between

the Republic and the Vatican. The Pope further protested against this diplomatic infringement of his own prerogatives in very forceful language, with the result that the French Ambassador to the Holy See was withdrawn. Relations between the spiritual and secular authorities grew worse by the summoning to Rome, without consulting the French Cabinet, and contrary to the spirit of the *Concordat*, of two bishops. M. Combes' answer was to dismiss the Papal Nuncio from Paris—and the *Concordat*, the religious settlement of the great Napoleon, was practically at an end. Separation between Church and State was decided upon, so a special committee, in 1904, was appointed to settle the question. The head of the Commission was M. Briand, a Socialist deputy of resource and tact. Meanwhile the Ministry of M. Combes fell, chiefly on a point connected with the military administration of the unpopular General André, who had succeeded the Marquis de Gallifet, and the fire-eating anti-Clerical was well out of the way. The new Premier, M. Rouvier, was bound to carry on the policy of his predecessor. The Law of Disestablishment was passed, and its stated principle was the freedom of all religious organizations, that such religious organizations should be required to make an inventory of their properties under State supervision, which in turn had to be transferred to Associations of Public Worship. To such a revolutionary proceeding it was naturally impossible for the Pope to bow; it amounted to spoliation plus separation. "He enjoined upon the Catholics in France to consider it as null and void. He preferred to sacrifice the property of the French Church rather than permit the faithful to establish the associations for public worship ordained by the legislature to take charge of and administer its goods."¹ The result of this papal edict was, of course, to cause a distinct cleavage in the ranks of society; the extension of the crusade against ultramontanist to the inevitable proscription of the hard-working and usually excellent parish priest was bound to shock the feelings of loyal and peaceable moderate Catholics. The execution of the law in the matter of the inventories led to regrettable scenes, and the financial liquidation of establishments was not effected without the breath of scandal. But such events are too recent to stand the test of fair criticism. The fierceness, however, of the conflict abated by the removal of M. Combes and the appointment of M. Briand, who carried out the law in a spirit of moderation and, to some degree, with a distinct show of sympathy.

The most remarkable phenomenon was the seeming indifference of general public opinion to the changes; but that indifference may not have been very actual, and can possibly be accounted for by the greater interest evoked by the pressing labour problems of the period. Moreover, there is to-day an indisputably better understanding between Church and State.

The most remarkable factor of recent French politics has been the rise of the Socialists, which to some extent has been at the expense of the ultramontanist and the Clerico-Monarchists, and it is significant

¹ Professor Emile Bourgeois, *Cambridge Modern History*, XII, p. 122.

that the Separation Law was carried out by the Socialist Minister, M. Briand.

The party after the excesses of the Commune suffered eclipse, and gained no headway until the amnesty of 1879. A flood of newspapers devoted to the cause made their appearance, of which *L'Égalité*, under the editorship of Jules Guesde—the practical founder of the Socialist party—was the most important. The doctrine of Collectivism increased in favour and was the chief war-cry of the Society of "Socialist Workers" founded in 1880. The Collectivists, opposed by the more prudent Radicals, of whom M. Clemenceau was the best example, gave way to a party content with gradual reforms, which became known as the "Possibilists". In 1884 the recognition by the Government of trade unions bettered the lot of the working-man, and gave an enormous impetus to the principle of co-operation—a principle which was fostered for many years by the Socialists, who gained a great leader in the conversion of M. Jaurès in 1887. The year 1889 marks the *rapprochement* between the Republicans and the Collectivists, by which State aid was promised for the consideration of the more pressing labour problems, while the Collectivists undertook to abandon revolutionary methods. The effect of this compromise was, in 1890, to produce a law for the rights of miners, followed by compensation for breach of contract, and, in 1891, the creation of a Supreme Council of Labour. In spite of a set-back in 1892, owing to severe strikes in the north and terrifying anarchist outrages, the Socialist party gained fifty seats in the Chamber during the following year. Between 1894 and 1898 the Socialists met with the opposition of the middle classes, as the sad event of Carnot's death had caused alarm at the prevalence of anarchism, while the action of the Clericals during the Dreyfus agitation had brought suspicion on all movements that seemed to have their origin in irreligion. But the *concordat* between the Republic and the Collectivists was firmly cemented by the adroitness of M. Waldeck Rousseau, who included their leader, M. Millerand, in his Ministry "for the defence of the Republic", to the annoyance of the extremists or *Guesdists*, who at a great congress held on 3 December, 1899, broke with the reforming or Moderate Socialists under such leaders as Jaurès and Millerand. But the presence of a man like Millerand in the Cabinet enabled the passing of much useful legislation for the benefit of the working-classes, such as the restriction of the hours of labour, and the foundation of various Labour boards and councils. For several years the Socialist party was brilliantly led by Jaurès, who managed to keep the extremists in hand; but the accession of Clemenceau to office in 1906 marked the beginning of differences between the Radicals and the Socialists, perhaps due in some measure to the Premier's open hostility to Socialism, but more actually to the outbreak of revolutionary schemes, such as anti-militarism and syndicalism, and the revulsion in public feeling caused by highly inconvenient and often futile strikes which had the sanction of the General Confederation of Labour.

M. Clemenceau was, oddly enough, succeeded by a Socialist Premier,

M. Briand, and the relations between the Socialists and Radicals instead of improving grew worse. M. Briand's Socialism was of the mild or "Possibilist" order, and he placed the safety of the State before individualistic propaganda. The rupture between the two Socialist groups became complete by the outcry raised at the rigorous way in which M. Briand put an end to the railway strike of 1910, and by the resignations of Millerand and Viviani on the question of making railway strikes illegal. The Socialist *bloc* was now dissolved, and the relations between the party and the Radical Republicans developed into a mutual watchfulness.

M. Loubet's term of office came to an end in 1906, and, wisely refusing to allow himself to be proposed for a fresh term, he retired into private life to the accompaniment of the respect and goodwill of the whole nation. The presidency of M. Loubet had witnessed some of the most turbulent moments of French history, and to have retained the helm of State during such storms as the Dreyfus case and the anti-Clerical campaign called for qualities of statesmanship of the highest order. The two most important international events of Loubet's regime were the drawing together of the bonds of the understandings between Russia and Great Britain, in the one case by the brilliant State visit of the Emperor and Empress to Paris in 1901, and in the other by M. Loubet's enthusiastic welcome in London. The success of the visits found their proof in the effectiveness of French diplomacy at the Congress of Algeciras. M. Loubet's successor was M. Fallières, the chairman of the Senate, a man very much of the same type as the late President, of yeoman origin, with the similar qualities of shrewd common sense. M. Fallières' regime is rather too recent for adequate criticism. After the fall of M. Rouvier's Ministry the premiership passed to M. Clemenceau, who was at once plunged into a conflict with the subversive forces of anarchism, and the endeavour to soothe the ecclesiastical position. To President Fallières was left the last vestiges of the Dreyfus case by the reinstatement of the captain in the army and the promotion of Colonel Picquart to the rank of a brigadier-general. During his presidency France had to weather the Moroccan crisis of 1911, involved by the "Agadir" incident, and meet the German menace betimes by the heavy increase to the army of 1913 with the institution of three years' service instead of two. Like M. Loubet, President Fallières, on the completion of his septennate in 1913, did not seek re-election, and the vote of the Congress fell upon the present distinguished occupant of the Élysée, M. Poincaré.

French foreign policy since 1871 has been a forward one outside Europe, and at home one of recuperation and reorganization, with the abandonment of all dreams of military glory, in the German sense of imposing her own culture on an unwilling continent. Between 1871 and 1880 is a distinctly quiet period in which the French are slowly, courageously, and laboriously consolidating their country from the effects of the war of 1870-1. The bitter memories of defeat, and the loss of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine are not allowed to die out

—the sense of national honour is too strong for that—but there is not necessarily an open, provocative policy of revenge. There is a grim determination that never again shall her eastern neighbour catch her at an overwhelming disadvantage, neither shall there be any feeble spirit of humility shown in the presence of the threatening array of Teutonic bayonets. France after 1871 started on a vigorous policy of defence, and so marvellously did she succeed, both from a military and economic point of view, that by 1875 she had caused the greatest alarm to the supreme Bismarck, who, had he dared, and as we have already told, would have instantly declared war against her.

By the year 1881 the work of reorganization was complete, and France was once more in a position to take her rightful place as a first-class Power. In that year, by the occupation of Tunis, she started upon that spirited colonial policy which eventually left her the greatest territorial power in Africa. The acquiring of Tunis, which was occupied by the goodwill of both Great Britain and Germany, had the unfortunate result of estranging her with Italy and throwing that country into the Triple Alliance, but now that Italy has been indemnified by Tripoli the relations between the two natural Latin allies have steadily improved.

The audacity of French colonial policy has often been provoking to her neighbours, who have sometimes felt themselves overreached by the keenness of French intellect. For it must be remembered that French colonial ambitions do not run in the direction of founding new nations for a mother State, but of founding profitable markets for the benefit of the French people at home. In other words, the French found protectorates and develop them by a system of "peaceful penetration". This explains the success of a people of forty millions with little necessity for expansion in Madagascar and in Indo-China. The principle of the "sphere of influence" acknowledged by the Congress of Berlin, 1885, has been of an enormous assistance to the methods of French colonization. It enabled France to gain her ascendancy in North-West Africa, to found the French Congo, and we have already, in the chapter on the Partition of Africa, made note of her successes in the Niger and in Senegal. French "peaceful penetration" has been bound to overlap with the activities of other nations, prepared to adopt the same methods of colonization, hence the ill-feeling with Italy over Tunis and with Germany over Morocco, though in the latter case German pretensions were of the flimsiest.

Throughout the 'eighties there was continuous rivalry between Great Britain and France owing to the British occupation of Egypt, a rivalry which was largely traditional and academic because of the rivalries of the past. Moreover, the occupation of Egypt was thrust upon Great Britain and not sought by her; consequently when the dual control of the country came to an end with the refusal of the French to participate in the continuance of the work of Egyptian consolidation, she had no other course left her in the general European interest but to remain where she was. The problem of the Sudan made an early evacuation of Egypt impos-

sible. Nevertheless the French suspicion of British designs in Northern Africa died hard, and the unfortunate Fashoda incident might easily have produced a European war. Happily this episode was cleared up satisfactorily, and from that moment the mutual respect which both countries have felt towards each other blossomed into an understanding that was eventually to ripen into firm alliance. The significant fact remains that, however acute the colonial rivalry may have been between the British and French, a settlement has always been effected that has been prompted on both sides by the dictates of ancient chivalry.

Since the beginning of the century the German designs against France have been patent to French statesmen. For the last ten years, together with a spirited colonial policy to develop the material resources of the nation, vigorous precautions have been taken to resist invasion; the army and the navy were strengthened, and the Russian alliance was sought.

The Russian alliance became possible by the conclusion of the treaty between Germany and Austria, when, it may be said, the Pan-Germanic and the Pan-Slavonic cleavage definitely took place. Austrian designs in the Near East and France's lost provinces, together with convenient French loans, created mutual interests between the two nations which were to be fraught with the greatest consequences to Europe. It must, however, be confessed that the Dual Alliance was regarded at first with suspicion in this country, and British naval construction, involving the two-power standard, was the answer to it. But German intrigue during the South African War, and the enormous increase of the German navy, built with a design to French colonial possessions and the ruin of the British Empire, drew France and Great Britain closer together at a time when the value of the Dual Alliance was weakened by the disastrous war with Japan. During 1904 important understandings took place between Paris and London, whereby the British occupation of Egypt was recognized, the French fishery dispute in Newfoundland was settled, and the sphere of French influence in Morocco delimited.

The Moroccan question twice provided an excuse for German diplomacy to test the solidity of the *entente*, in 1905 and 1911, and on each occasion that diplomacy retired worsted. The Agadir incident was a bitter blow to German prestige, and triumphant France obtained her protectorate over Morocco.

The lesson of Agadir was not lost. France recognized the danger to her colonies, yet still hoped to live peaceably with her powerful neighbour; but the startling German Army Bill of 1913 had to find a spirited reply in the institution of a three years' military service. Previous to this year France had mainly relied upon her skilful diplomacy to parry the efforts of the Potsdam military party, who retaliated by bullying M. Delcassé out of office on the failure of the first Moroccan attempt in 1905. The Republic has cultivated better relations with her sister Latin nation by the settling of old-standing disputes, which has borne such satisfactory fruit during the present war. But the greatest triumph

of French diplomacy was the part it took in effecting the understanding between Great Britain and Russia, which took place in 1907, and culminated with the ceremonious visit of the Russian Emperor to these shores, and the founding of the Triple Entente. That Germany intended to make France pay dear for this triumph, the events which led up to this present war clearly prove; and that the Triple Entente is more than a mere agreement upon mutual interests, but a direct factor for the salvation of European liberties, becomes more evident day by day.

CHAPTER XVI

ITALY

When on 20 September, 1870, the Italian troops under General Cadorna poured through the breach of Porta Pia into the Eternal City the unity of Italy was completed. The victory of Sedan, which had necessitated the withdrawal of the French garrison from Rome, may be said to have founded two national systems, the German and the Italian, yet, strangely enough, to have left behind it two problems which were to be a source of weakness to the work of consolidating the two young nations—the acquisition of Alsace and Lorraine, and the abolition of the temporal power. But there the parallel ends; for the wound inflicted on the ancient prerogatives of the Vatican has happily with the course of time shown signs of healing. Nevertheless for many years the sharp cleavage between Church and State in Italy was to be a source of weakness, entailing as it did the withdrawal of much excellent Catholic activity from the public service to the tremendous work of regeneration before the young kingdom. In spite of the “law of guarantees” by which the prerogatives of the Holy See were fully guaranteed, the opposition of Pius IX, who refused to recognize the law, backed by incessant ultramontane intrigue abroad, caused the opening years of Vittorio Emmanuele’s occupation of the Quirinal to be full of dangers.

After the death of Cavour, for some years the administration of affairs rested in the hands of the Conservatives, better known as the Right, who had so successfully steered the ship during the *risorgimento*; but with the passing away of its great men, who seemingly could not be replaced, and the discontent caused by its fiscal policy, the Right gradually lost its popularity with the nation, and the Ministry of Minghetti resigned in 1876. But in spite of the national dislike to the taxation imposed by the brilliant Finance Minister, Quintino Sella, who restored the hated grist tax, popularly known as the *tassa della fame* (the hunger tax), it must be admitted that when the Conservatives resigned office the national exchequer for the first time showed a surplus, while considerable steps were taken to acquire the railways from their foreign proprietors.

The king, Vittorio Emmanuele, at once entrusted the formation of

a Ministry to the leader of the Left, Agostino Depretis, and at the general election which ensued his followers obtained an overwhelming majority. Depretis, an ex-pro-dictator of Sicily and converted Republican, assumed office with a weight of promises of reform, such as the abolition of the grist tax, electoral revision, and the institution of compulsory education. He at once summoned to his Cabinet prominent Radicals like Nicotera, Zanardelli, Crispi, and Cairole; but the team which had worked well in opposition refused to pull together when in harness, and dissensions immediately arose. In contrast to the old political cohesion of the Conservatives of the Right, the new Government of the Left presented themselves as a party of faction. The Premier, Depretis, who practically held office for ten years, proved himself more skilful as a politician than as an administrator, and was the first to introduce into Italian politics the pernicious system known as "Transformism"; in other words, the trafficking in offices with those heads of parties in the Chamber who commanded most votes. But for the passing of some useful measures with regard to elementary education and the regulation of the employment of women and children, as well as an elaborate Bill for electoral reform, the Depretis Ministry is chiefly remarkable for inaction, petty political expediences, and a heavy increase in the national expenditure.

The month of January, 1878, brought death to two heroes of the *risorgimento*, General Alfonso La Marmora, the distinguished leader of the Sardinian troops in the Crimea and the victor of Solferino, and *il Re Galantuomo* himself, King Vittorio Emmanuele II. The death of the gallant king, who in good times and bad had for thirty years piloted United Italy to her high destiny, caused a profound sensation in Europe. To mark the new era of an Italian dynasty, instead of resting with his ancestors in the Superga at Turin, Vittorio Emmanuele was buried in the Pantheon in Rome, amidst scenes of impressive grandeur. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Humbert.

Scarcely were the obsequies of King Vittorio Emmanuele over than there died Pope Pius IX, the last of the sovereign pontiffs of Rome, who at first had supported the national cause, but by force of circumstances had eventually been compelled to uphold the traditions of the Holy See. It is, however, pleasant to reflect that the animosity of Pius was merely political, and one of his last actions was to send his blessing to the dying king. The Conclave that followed was interesting, both for its brevity and for the evidences of the good faith of the Italian Government in the perfect liberty accorded to it. The meeting was an extraordinarily full one, sixty-one cardinals out of a possible sixty-four being present; within thirty-six hours Cardinal Giochino Pecci was unanimously elected to the Papacy, and assumed the title of Leo XIII. The new Pope continued the policy of antagonism to the existing regime.

On the death of Depretis in 1887, Francesco Crispi was summoned to power. After the colourless and somewhat lethargic administration of Depretis, the advent of such a strong man was welcome to the nation


at large, even if it was regarded unfavourably by the Court. The House of Savoy was not likely to be drawn towards the old Revolutionist, who had opposed the French alliance, and had relinquished his natural Republican convictions to adhere to the Monarchy, because "the Monarchy unites us; the Republic would divide us". In addition he was socially handicapped by the sad circumstances of his domestic life. But Crispi was so overwhelmingly the man of the moment that no other appointment was possible. The influence of the new Minister was soon felt, and an unwonted activity was insisted upon in the various Government departments. But the pressure of work—for he had also assumed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—told on the temper of Crispi, a fact which, added to a natural brusquerie of manner, increased the number of his enemies.

Crispi, of course, succeeded to the mistakes as well as the policy of his predecessor. The cynical expedient of *trasformismo* had created so many local interests that there was a scandalous waste of public money, while the entrance of Italy into the Triple Alliance necessitated an increased expenditure on the army and the navy. The balance left by the Conservative Budget was soon changed by the corrupt practices of the Left into a heavy deficit. Moreover, the financial embarrassment was increased by a rash colonial expansion, that was prompted by a desire to uphold the dignity of the young nation in the general scramble for African possessions in the early 'eighties, of which we have already made note.

In 1870 the Rubattino Shipping Company had purchased for a mere song from a local sultan the Bay of Assab in the Red Sea as a coaling station; but as the title to this position was never recognized by the Egyptian Government, the Italian Foreign Minister of the time, Visconti-Venosta, deemed it prudent merely to wink at the Rubattino occupation. But in 1881, owing to the mediation of the British Government, the formal occupation of a purely commercial station at Assab by the Rubattino line was permitted, which in 1882 formally transferred its rights to the Italian Government. Acting on a hint from Downing Street, and with a view to gaining the goodwill of Great Britain, which at the time was involved in the Sudan question, in 1885 Depretis acquiesced in the dispatch of Italian troops to Massowah. Unfortunately the abandonment of the Sudan by the Gladstone Government frustrated the Italian hopes, and efforts made from Rome to conciliate the Negus, John, of Abyssinia proved fruitless. Nevertheless the Italians persisted in their efforts to gain healthy territory in the hinterland, and were requested by the Negus to withdraw to the coast. Suddenly in January, 1887, the Abyssinian chief, Ras Alula, gathered together a huge force, and, after meeting with an unimportant check at Saiti on the following day (27 January), completely surprised an Italian force of 524 officers and men. The whole battalion was literally cut to pieces, and it is said that only one man succeeded in escaping. The news of the disaster was received in Italy with consternation and anger, and immediate steps were taken to avenge the reverse. Crispi, who



KING HUMBERT OF ITALY



SIGNOR CRISPI

From photographs by Brogi, Florence

NAWAB SALAR JUNG BAHADUR



VICTOR EMMANUEL III, KING OF ITALY



QUEEN ELENA OF ITALY

From photographs by Giugoni & Bossi

had now succeeded Depretis, obtained a substantial monetary grant, and a force of 20,000 men was dispatched under the leadership of General di San Marzano. A British attempt at mediation having failed, the Negus, John, appeared before the Italian fortresses; but owing to a variety of causes, of which sickness among his troops was the chief, he deemed it prudent to retire without giving battle. Italian intrigue had in the meanwhile detached Menelik, an Abyssinian vassal chieftain, from the side of the Negus, who marched to overthrow him. The news, however, of the Mahdist rising suddenly diverted the Negus from his purpose, and he promptly decided to subdue the dervishes before settling with the rebel Menelik; but the forces of the Mahdists proved superior, and he was defeated and killed at Metammeh on 10 March, 1889.

The death of the Negus provided several pretenders for the Abyssinian throne, and for some time a state of civil war prevailed. The Crispi Ministry instructed Count Antonelli to give Italian support to Menelik, and a treaty was signed at Ucciali (2 May, 1889) by which the relations between Italy and Abyssinia were defined, although somewhat loosely, and possessions in the plateau of the hinterland—Halai, Saganeiti, and Asmara—were conceded to Italy. Crispi interpreted the terms of the Treaty of Ucciali into a direct protectorate over Abyssinia. The new colony was given the name of Erythrea, elaborate commemorative medals were struck, and the Italian sphere of influence was even extended to the Somali peninsula. Crispi, jealous for the reputation of the young kingdom abroad, dreamed of Italy as an African power, and busy operations proceeded in the new colony.

Overburdened by his dual responsibilities of Foreign Minister as well as of Premier, the temper of Crispi grew worse, and he manifested an insolent contempt of Parliamentary usage, especially in his relations with the old historic party of the Right. At the end of January, 1891, the infuriated Conservatives laid a trap for him into which he fell. A division was challenged, and the Government was found in the minority. Crispi at once resigned, and a coalition Cabinet was formed under the Marquis di Rudini. The Rudini Ministry had but a very short life, although interesting with regard to foreign relations, especially in the negotiations for the renewal of the Triple Alliance, and in May, 1892, it gave way to the Cabinet of Signor Giolitti. His administration was one of the most discreditable in Italian annals, for the new Premier proved himself a past-master in the art of electoral corruption; in fact, he was quite unscrupulous as to his methods, provided he could maintain his power. The sudden discovery of scandal in the administration of the State banks, and especially of the Banca Romana, involved Giolitti, who had advanced Tanlongo, the defaulting director of the Banca Romana, to senatorial rank. The Premier in vain denied complicity, and endeavoured to avoid an enquiry; but he was forced to bow to popular clamour, and a Commission was appointed, whose report confirmed the scandalous irregularities of Tanlongo, and revealed the neglect of State banks by various administrations. The conduct of

Giolitti in deceiving the Chamber, together with his whitewashing of the deeds of Tanlongo, was censured in the strongest language, although no direct case for impeachment was advanced. Meanwhile Giolitti had displayed singular incompetence abroad with regard to the Aigue-mortes massacre of Italian workmen and the consequent anti-French riots throughout the peninsula, while at home the outbreak of serious rioting in Naples and agrarian insurrection in Sicily had found him quite incapable of dealing with the situations in a statesmanlike way. He was driven from office by the popular disgust, and in deference to the universal wish, King Humbert was forced to summon Crispi to office for the second time.

Crispi set to work to quell the Sicilian rising in ruthless fashion. Martial law was proclaimed, and revolutionary and political societies of all kinds were suppressed. In fact the legal enquiries were conducted by military commission with a savageness that recalled Bourbon methods.

Scarcely was the Sicilian trouble quietened than the Parliamentary Commission on the Bank Scandals issued its report. In dramatic fashion Giolitti rose in the Chamber and denounced Crispi for having accepted bribes from Tanlongo for the purposes of electoral corruption. But the evidence was flimsy and recoiled on Giolitti's head; for he had made shameful use of purely private correspondence, and thus compromising himself still further in the unsavoury business, found it convenient to retire into exile for a while.

Crispi, who by now had earned the confidence of the monarchy, seized the opportunity to dissolve Parliament, after having struck off, under a pretext of electoral revision, many thousands of his political opponents from the voting lists, and returned to power with a majority of 200. Crispi's triumph was now complete, and a long tenure of office seemed open for him; but within two years the failure of his African plans dashed his hopes to the ground.

No sooner had Menelik consolidated his rule in Abyssinia than he repudiated the Italian claim to a protectorate and denounced the treaty of Ucciali, while he bettered his position, behind the back of the Italian Government, by coming to terms with his old rival Mangascia Ras. Bath-Agos, chief of the Okule-Kusai, meanwhile intrigued with Mangascia and Menelik to organize a revolt against the Italian occupation. The governor of Erythrea, General Barratieri, promptly marched against Mangascia and defeated him on 13 January, 1895, thus occupying the Tigré. Barratieri was deceived by the ease of his conquest, and made no preparation to withstand a counter-attack from the Abyssinians, and Menelik, who had now come to the rescue of Mangascia, advanced with 100,000 men against him. After cutting off and surrounding the forces, amounting to 2000, of Major Toselli at Amba-Alagi, the Abyssinians invested the Fort of Makaleh, which capitulated after a gallant defence of a month, the heroic garrison being allowed to march out with the honours of war to join the main Italian troops.

In the meanwhile Barratieri, who had been reinforced from Italy, although the organization of the commissariat was exceedingly defective, advanced with 14,000 men against the Abyssinians at Adowa. Barratieri, probably recognizing the superior strength of the enemy, continued to act on the defensive; but owing to the angry dispatches of Crispi, who asked for vigorous action, he felt himself compelled to allay public opinion and lead his inadequate forces into action. The result was a hideous fiasco, for in addition to a paucity of numbers against the enemy, the Italians were badly led; the wings of the army divided, and a whole brigade went astray. The forces of Barratieri were utterly routed, and nearly a third of the army perished, while another third was taken prisoner.

The news of the disaster of Adowa was received in Italy with the greatest indignation, and the Government's conduct of the war was so sharply condemned by the popular voice that Crispi resigned without even challenging a vote of the Chamber, and with him vanished the virus of Italian aggression. The new Ministry under the leadership of the Marquis di Rudini completely reversed the policy of Crispi. In spite of the desire of the king to avenge the disaster of Adowa, after wearisome negotiation a peace was concluded with Menelik, to whom an indemnity was paid, by which the Italian occupation of the Tigré was abandoned and the boundary of the Mareb-Belesa-Muna line was fixed.

Freed for the nonce from the incubus of colonial expansion, Italy could turn her attention to the sad needs of domestic reform. For some time indications of popular discontent with the general state of political and civil corruption had been manifest, and this discontent reached a crisis in 1898 by a series of riots which almost amounted to revolution. The chief cause for this national upheaval must be traced to the rapid rise in the price of bread—the result of bad harvests—and the heavy taxation on imported corn. The sufferings of the people were undoubted, especially in Southern Italy and Sardinia. Rioting took place in Naples, Florence, in various provincial towns and cities, and even in Rome; but the worst outbreak was reserved for Milan, which city was under mob rule for three days. Martial law had to be proclaimed, and the victims to the soldiers' rifles soon amounted to an unheard-of number in civil disturbance. "Rich and cultured Milan, the moral and intellectual capital of Italy, beheld the jack-boot and sabre enthroned in her midst, and an indelible impression was left in her memory of a savage, military tyranny."¹ In addition to the precautions taken in the streets of the unfortunate city, even the prisoners were visited and suspects were dragged before the military tribunal.

The greatest consternation spread throughout Italy, and the popular faith in her political institutions was sadly shattered; the advent of red Republicanism was feared, and the unity of the realm seemed threatened. A coalition Cabinet was formed under General Pelloux, with a military leaven, and harsh measures for the quelling of the national disorders

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, p. 225.

ensued. The "Public Safety Bill" met with violent opposition from the members of the "Left"; and when Pelloux was unable to pass the measure through the Chamber because of the Parliamentary obstruction, he promulgated them by royal decree, relying on his majority to obtain a Bill of indemnity. These proceedings were, however, quashed by the Court of Cassation in February, 1900, and Pelloux again had to present his measure to the Chamber. To prevent obstruction the Premier attempted to reform the standing orders of the House, but such violent and disorderly scenes resulted from this high-handed proceeding that the transaction of public business became impossible. Pelloux had no other course left him but to dissolve the Chamber and appeal to the country. The result of the election was to return the Government with a majority, as usual obtained by the corrupt electoral machinery of the South; but with such an increase of strength to the Left as virtually to amount to a victory for that party. Pelloux consequently resigned; a Ministry of conciliation was formed under the aged Saracco, and a crisis which had threatened the foundations of the monarchy was happily at an end.

Shortly afterwards King Humbert, when on his return from a public function, was assassinated by the anarchist Bresci. Humbert had not been a great king, being of a somewhat obstinate and unyielding nature, but his honesty of purpose, soldierly qualities, and private charities had endeared him to his people. He was succeeded by his eldest son, the Prince of Naples, who ascended the throne as King Victor Emmanuel III. The new king had been better prepared for the duties of kingship in modern times than his father had been, and, possessing scholarly attainments, brought a keen intellect to bear upon the problems of the hour. He at once saw the necessity of social reforms—although keenly zealous for the maintenance of the defences of the realm—and on the fall of the weak Saracco Ministry in February, 1901, in spite of the pressure of the Conservative clique that had blinded the will of his father, boldly summoned Zanardelli to form an administration. Zanardelli appointed Giolitti as his Minister of the Interior, and the Zanardelli-Giolitti combination produced a strong working-class movement, the freedom of speech and public meeting being recognized. The result was rapid increase in the number of strikes, both industrial and agricultural; but with the exception of an ugly movement in Turin in 1902, the policy of non-intervention, if it led to some inconvenience, generally resulted in the obtaining of better terms for the men. Zanardelli succeeded in pushing through the Chamber a considerable amount of social legislation, of which the chief measures were Employers' Liability, Old Age Pensions, and the Factory Act, while the vexatious Octroi duties were abolished; moreover, in spite of incessant labour troubles during his administration, the financial position of the country steadily improved. Zanardelli fell a victim to the Socialist manoeuvres of the Left in connection with a proposed visit of the Emperor of Russia. He was succeeded by Giolitti, who, unable to reconcile the leaders of the Extreme Left,

was forced to rely upon Conservative support. The Ministry included Luzzatti, the most famous Finance Minister since Quintino Sella. Through his efforts Italian finance was placed on a sounder basis, and the budget of 1903-4 showed a pleasing surplus. His conversion of the National Debt in 1906 did much to relieve taxation.

On 3 August, 1903, the aged Pope, Leo XIII, died. At the Conclave which ensued Cardinal Sarto was elected to the See of St. Peter, owing to the Austrian veto to the general favourite, Cardinal Rampolla del Tindaro, the former Secretary of State. His Holiness assumed the title of Pius X.

In spite of its conservative leaven the Giolitti Administration proved to be no freer than its predecessor from the embarrassment of industrial strikes. On 16 September, 1904, an enormous strike was proclaimed by the Committee of Resistance, whose object was to force the resignation of the Government, which had become unpopular by the introduction of a sterner policy with regard to agitations. The movement spread with rapidity to Milan, Genoa, Rome, Florence, and Naples, and a veritable reign of terror took place. Giolitti acted with great wisdom, and the military power was used with becoming moderation. The sober-minded of the nation were now thoroughly disgusted with the turn of events, and a determined effort was made to crush the forces of anarchy. A movement in the right direction was effected by the withdrawal of the Papal ban, and Catholics were exhorted to vote for the party of law and order. The effect of this permission was tremendous: the forces of the Extreme Left were completely routed, and Giolitti returned to the Chamber with an overwhelming majority.

The problem of the railways became acute in 1905 owing to the expiry in that year of the private concessions. Giolitti had retired through illness, and Fortis formed an administration pledged to the State purchase of the railways. This was eventually accomplished, but the transference of the undertakings was performed in so haphazard a manner that chaos in the administration of the railways remained for a considerable time.

Fortis gave way to the upright Baron Sonnino in 1906, who, although a Conservative, attempted a coalition Government that marked the supreme height of "transformation". The leading men of all the parties were summoned to the Administration, but, in spite of well-laid plans of social and economic reform, the autocratic temper of Sonnino proved incapable of leading such an unwieldy team, and Giolitti, who had been carefully nursing the situation, once more assumed the direction of affairs. Giolitti undertook many of Sonnino's proposed reforms in a modified sense; the South received assistance by a reduction of land taxes, and an improvement in the administration of the railways was effected, while an extension of public education was granted. In 1906 a series of terrible earthquakes took place in Calabria, and nearly a million and a half of public money had to be spent in relief; nevertheless the national revenue showed a healthy surplus. But

the nation still feels the burden of the enormous national debt, which involves a taxation out of proportion to the revenue.

The foreign policy of Italy, up till the eve of the outbreak of the Great World War, has been mainly Germanophil. The seizure of Tunis by France so inflamed Italian opinion that the kingdom fell an easy victim to the blandishments of Bismarck, who was able to dangle before the eyes of Italian statesmen the danger of a French intervention to restore the temporal power and of Austrian reprisals. Although the Triple Alliance was renewed on several occasions it was never popular with the nation; Italy could never become reconciled to a friendship with Austria, the ancient enemy of her liberties. "In truth, her alliance with the Central Powers was based, not on goodwill to them, but on resentment against France."¹ Apart from the fact that in 1882 the relations between the Vatican and the Quirinal were particularly strained, another reason may be found in this unnatural league in Italy's necessity of an alliance with some first-class power. For some years after the occupation of Rome her foreign policy had been colourless and feeble, in the attempt to be friendly all round. After the failure of Crispi's grandiose colonial schemes in Africa, and the attempt to make the weight of a nation of 30,000,000 souls more adequately felt in the councils of Europe, the nation desired a period of repose in which to recuperate her internal resources. The alliance with the Germanic Powers may have cost her dear in armaments, but it undoubtedly gave her a feeling of security; at any rate she was safe from attack on her most vital frontier, and the excellent relations she preserved with Great Britain guaranteed the balance of naval power in the Mediterranean.

The Triple Alliance was one of expediency and not of sentiment, consequently Italy was more than once allowed to feel the sense of her inferiority to her more formidable allies. Gradually the old animosity displayed against France for her conduct with regard to Tunis became allayed; the end of the tariff war in 1898 and the tacit admission of the Italian sphere of influence in Tripoli drew the two nations closer together; while the visit of President Loubet to Rome in 1904 and the support afforded to France by Italy at the Congress of Algeciras cleared away the last vestiges of bad feeling.

The stability of the Triple Alliance, as far as Italy was concerned, received its first rude shock by the outbreak of the Tripolitan War. There can be no doubt, in the light of recent events, that the sudden determination of Italy in 1911 to strike at Tripoli was highly embarrassing to Germany, who had begun to see a prospect of her efforts for the rehabilitation of Turkey from a military standpoint; but she was unable to eat her own words, and, further, to have attempted to thwart Italy on the eve of the *Agadir* incident would have merely thrown her into the arms of a friendly France and played the Russian game.

Italy undoubtedly had reaped the reward of years of patience and had chosen her moment well. Probably expecting a diplomatic show of support from Germany, the attitude of the Young Turks towards Italy

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Development of the European Nations*, p. 329.

had been of so insolent a character, that the popular pressure exerted on Giolitti made the preservation of peace impossible. An ultimatum was issued to Constantinople, and the localization of the conflict was ensured with the other Powers. Mobilization took place on 20 September, and a week later a fleet of 100 ships in five divisions, each with 20,000 men, set sail from Naples amidst scenes of extraordinary enthusiasm. Meanwhile a flotilla under the Duke of Abruzzi had attacked Turkish torpedo-boats in the Adriatic, off Prevesa, and won a signal victory. The conflict in Tripoli developed rapidly, and the Italian navy effected a complete blockade of the coasts. On 5 October Commander Cagni landed a force of 1600 sailors and marines, at the direct invitation of the Arabs, to maintain order in Tripoli, and later General Caneva landed with 35,000 men. Demo was occupied on 10th October and Baghasu on the 19th. The treachery of the Arabs in the oases, whereby a regiment of the Bersaglieri was cut to pieces, forced General Caneva to abandon a conciliatory policy and resort to sterner methods. The rest of the campaign worked smoothly, and the Italian annexation of the Tripolitaine and Cyrenaica was proclaimed on 17 November. The Turks still held out, but a bombardment of the Dardanelles on 18 April brought the Government of the Porte to its senses. Peace was sued for, and a treaty was eventually concluded at Lausanne, whereby Turkey ceded Tripolitaine and Cyrenaica to Italy, and agreed to the payment of an indemnity, leaving certain of the Aegean islands in pawn.

The effect of the Tripolitan campaign was to reveal the weakness of Turkey and precipitate the Balkan War. During this exhausting war Italy preserved a strict neutrality, in spite of her jealousy of Serbian aspirations in the Adriatic, and suspicions of Austrian intrigue, although she combined with the latter Power to establish the kingdom of Albania at Serbian expense. The ties which bound Italy to the Germanic Powers had during the last decade been growing looser and looser; they had only been held together by motives of political expediency, but never by the attraction of mutual interests.

The sudden outbreak of the Great World War found Italy diplomatically uninformed as to the German plans and negotiations. It was so clearly a war of aggression that she unhesitatingly severed herself from the Triple Alliance and declared her neutrality. In fact, had the terms of the Triple Alliance been absolutely binding in any eventuality, no Italian statesman would have dared to declare for Germany in the face of the unanimous popular censure of her conduct.

CHAPTER XVII

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

I. SPAIN

After the expulsion of Isabella II in 1868, until the proclamation of Alfonso XII in 1874, Spain went through a period of anarchy and confusion. The principal revolutionaries under Marshal Prim, who had sent the Bourbon queen flying with her children and courtiers into France, succeeded in dishing the Republicans and determined to establish a Constitutional Monarchy. In the absence of an eligible Spanish prince their choice fell upon Amadeo of Savoy, a son of Victor Emmanuel. Amadeo accepted the crown and endeavoured to fulfil his arduous duty in the strictest spirit of the Constitution; but he was foredoomed to unpopularity, firstly with the haughty Spanish Catholics for being the son of the destroyer of the temporal power, and secondly with the nation at large for being the nominee of a mere party, that of the advanced Liberals. Even the circumstances of his landing were wrapped in tragedy, for on that very day Marshal Prim, his political sponsor, breathed his last, foully murdered by his enemies. The reign of the Savoyard king lasted two years. Apart from the insulting treatment he received from his subjects, he perceived that it was impossible for him to effect necessary reforms with only a slender political backing and confronted with open disloyalty. Moreover, he soon recognized the fact that he was merely a tool in the hands of a certain section which had invited him to occupy the throne. Accordingly on 12 February, 1873, in the house of the Cortes, "Amadeo, in a dignified address to the Spanish people, which should have made the most hardened blush with shame, surrendered into their hands the crown which, whilst he had worn it at least, had suffered no dishonour."¹

It then became the turn of the Republicans; for it must be remembered that Spain was divided into three factions, the Carlists, the Republicans, and the Alfonsists. At the fall of Isabella II the Carlists were formidable, and gathered strength from the adhesion of the clergy, who disliked the Savoyard regime; but they were divided among themselves—the official head, Don Juan de Bourbon, being repudiated by his own sons—and there was no statesmanship displayed in their intriguing. The general recognition of the party was eventually extended to Don Juan's son, Don Carlos. During the short reign of Amadeo, Don Carlos issued a proclamation, and a rising was started in Catalonia by his brother, Don Alfonso; and he himself entered Spain at Vera, in the Basque country. But he was defeated at Dronquista by General Moroner, and Carlism degenerated into guerrilla warfare.

On the abdication of Amadeo, the two Chambers of Cortes sat together and proclaimed a Federal Republic, consequently men of moderate views were driven to the Carlist cause; but Don Carlos refused

¹ Martin Hume's *Modern Spain*, p. 506.

to profit by the opportunity which was open to him, and the waiting Alfonsists began to see their chance.

The Federal Republican Government was soon in difficulties, and a conflict broke out with the Cantonalists of the South. Figueras became President of the Republic, and Castelar Minister of State. By this time Spain was a seething mass of disorder, and anarchy reigned supreme. The army was demoralized, and the forces of Carlism occupied the open country. Don Carlos re-entered Spain on 17 July, 1873, and established himself in strength in Navarre and the Basque provinces. Meanwhile the "Cantonist" movement in the South had spread alarmingly, and independent rebellions took place at Cartagena, Seville, Cadiz, Malaga, and Cordova. The Republic leaders, fed on academic theories, proved quite incapable of dealing with the situation, and Figueras fled to France before the meeting of the first Republican Cortes. The deputies elected Pi y Margall as President, who failed lamentably, and gave way to Salmeron, who showed some capacity for government, but was afraid to trust the army. Finally, on 7 September, 1873, the Cortes summoned Emilio Castelar to preside. Castelar immediately set out to restore the discipline of the army, in order to maintain security and order, and proceeded to act with vigour against his enemies. General Dominguez subdued Cartagena, while General Jovellar was sent to Cuba, and the campaign against the Carlists was pressed ruthlessly. The Cortes suspended their sittings, and Castelar was left Dictator; but he declined the advice of General Pavia to continue the dictatorship illegally. Consequently Pavia decided to act for himself. When the Cortes met on 2 January, 1874, Castelar, whose methods had filled the Red Republicans with alarm, was vigorously attacked in the Chamber and the Government was defeated. But suddenly the members found themselves surrounded by Pavia's troops, and were ordered to leave the building. Pavia refused to exercise the power he had gained to his own personal advantage, and a provisional government was formed under the leadership of General Serrano with Sagasta and Martos as colleagues. The constitution was suspended and the Republic ceased to be.

The news, in February, of Carlist successes sent Serrano hurriedly to the front. The campaign against them made slow but sure progress; Bilbao was relieved, and eventually Catalonia and the centre of Spain were freed.

It now became evident that the moment of the Alfonsists had arrived. The party, under the able guidance of Don Antonio Canovas del Castillo, had been warily sounding public opinion, and agents of the movement had been secretly at work in every town. The provisional government winked at their proceedings, although Sagasta, the Home Minister, made a show of repression. The object of Canovas del Castillo was to prevent the young prince from being proclaimed by the military and to secure his election as far as was possible by constitutional means, after the Carlists had been quashed. But the military leaders, nevertheless, brought matters to a head. On 29 December, 1874, General Martinez Campos proclaimed Alfonso XII at Sagunto, and the army generally

followed suit. Canovas del Castillo promptly adhered to the military party, and returned to Madrid, when he assumed the duties of Prime Minister for the young prince.

Alfonso, who at the time was a cadet at Sandhurst, hurried at the call of Canovas to Spain, and being accorded a hearty welcome at Barcelona, the most revolutionary city of Spain, proceeded to a perfect ovation at Madrid. Alfonso at once confirmed Canovas del Castillo in his position, and a Conservative administration was formed. The Ministry promptly undertook the arduous work of pacifying the country, so that by degrees all orders in the State, and even the constitutional Carlists, rallied round the young Alfonso. Gradually the forces of Marshal Quesada surrounded the remnant forces of the Carlists; by the beginning of 1876 the rising was quashed, and Alfonso returned triumphant to Madrid.

From 1875 to 1881 Señor Canovas was busy in organizing the new monarchy. He ruled his own Conservative and Catholic party with an iron hand, but encouraged the co-operation of the various divergent politicians in the State, provided that they recognized the monarchy. Thus he persuaded the Liberals under Sagasta to declare themselves dynastic Liberals, and for the first time admitted to the Cortes representatives from Cuba and Porto Rico.

In 1878 King Alfonso, amidst scenes of unparalleled grandeur, was married to his cousin, Mercedes, daughter of the Duc de Montpensier. The alliance was disliked by his ministers, and positively forbidden by his mother, the exiled Queen Isabella, who hated the Duc de Montpensier; but the young king insisted on having his way. The marriage proved but a short idyll of five months, for in the summer the young queen died. Within seventeen months Alfonso, acting on the advice of his ministers, married the Archduchess Maria Christina of Austria.

Meanwhile the dynastic Liberals, led by Sagasta, had grown restive under a state of persistent opposition, so Canovas, in the interest of the monarchy, connived at the idea of a rotative system, and found a pretext in a financial dispute with the king to tender his resignation. Sagasta formed an administration which was chiefly concerned in commercial legislation. Henceforth he and Canovas held office alternately. In 1885 Spain was visited by a terrible attack of Asiatic cholera, which soon spread to Madrid. Alfonso showed the greatest bravery and solicitude for his subjects during the outbreak, and penetrated into the most dangerous of plague-infested spots. During the autumn of the same year Spain was plunged into excitement by the German attempt to seize the Caroline Islands. Alfonso refused to listen to the popular clamour for war with Germany, and eventually submitted the whole case to the arbitration of the Pope, who decided mainly in favour of the Spanish contentions.

But the king's health was breaking down; the dread scourge of consumption had seized him. The Government took the most elaborate precautions to keep the fact secret, but it was in vain; the disease



ALFONSO XII, KING OF SPAIN

From a photograph by Debas, Madrid



QUEEN MARIA CHRISTINA OF SPAIN

From a photograph by Fianszen, Madrid



ALFONSO XIII, KING OF SPAIN

From a photograph by Debas, Madrid



QUEEN VICTORIA EUGENIA OF SPAIN

From a photograph by Fianszen, Madrid

took its fell course, and Alfonso XII passed away at El Pardo on 25 November, 1885.

Six months after the death of Alfonso XII his posthumous son was born, Alfonso XIII. Doña Maria Christina with calm dignity at once asserted her right to the regency, and in the face of the danger from foreign intrigue, she was unanimously supported in her resolve by the sober politicians of the realm. After the birth of her son she consolidated her position, even if she did not command the affection of her people, by the wisdom, tact, and justice of her sway. The regency was immediately accepted with cordiality by every European Power, while in order to prevent the outbreak of Carlism, Pope Leo XIII himself offered to be godfather to the infant Alfonso. Maria Christina, acting on Canova's advice, who doubted the wisdom of beginning the regency under Conservative auspices, summoned Sagasta to El Pardo, when an arrangement was come to, known politically as the Pact of El Pardo, between Canovas, Sagasta, and the generals, by which they promised each other mutual assistance in maintaining law and order amongst the parliamentary rank and file. Parliaments were to continue to their full terms, and, in fact, the principle of rotative government was acknowledged. The regency was mainly concerned in domestic politics, of which the institution of universal suffrage was the most important, until the year 1890, when on the return of Canovas to power Spain was confronted with the problem of the loss of her colonial possessions. Ever since 1878, on the failure of the liberal promises of Martinez Campos, whose promises were immediately repudiated at Madrid, the Cubans had been furthering their cause for independence in the United States, and the first successful outbreak took place at San Domingo in 1895. Martinez Campos was sent out to conciliate the insurgents. His efforts failed, and, acting on his advice of taking drastic measures, General Weyler, familiarly known as "the Butcher", was dispatched on a mission of what is nowadays known as "frightfulness". His policy was to herd the miserable peasants in concentration camps, and devastate their lands with a view to starving out the rebels. The methods of Weyler were so abominable and outrageous that the conscience of the civilized world was shocked. Disgust with his administration was strongly felt in the United States, which, apart from offering an asylum to many Cuban refugees, possessed considerable financial interests in the island, and the detestation of "frightfulness" spread even to Spain. In August, 1897, Canovas was murdered by an Italian anarchist, and after a brief interval Sagasta returned to power. A prompt reversal of policy with regard to Cuba took place. Blanco, with promises of autonomy, was sent out, and preparations for Home Rule were at once undertaken. But matters had gone too far; it was hopeless to expect the Cubans to believe in the professed conciliation in the light of past misrule and the climax of Weyler's evil deeds. The Republican Government held out firmly for complete independence. Meanwhile the patience of the United States Government, which had been watch-

ing events, became exhausted. Various warnings had been issued by President Cleveland, and later by President McKinley. The turbulence in Havana increased, and the United States warship *Maine* was dispatched to the city for the protection of American interests. On the night of 15 February, 1898, the *Maine* was suddenly blown up by a mine, with an appalling loss of life. The event proved too much for American opinion, although it was subsequently established that the Spanish authorities had not been concerned in the catastrophe, and there was a national clamour for war.

An ultimatum was presented to Spain demanding the withdrawal of Spanish troops from Cuba and the complete independence of the island. The terms were, of course, refused; diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off on 20 April, 1898, and the Spanish fleet was dispatched on its hopeless quest. The fleet in the Far East was defeated by Admiral Dewey in Manila Bay. The main Spanish fleet under Admiral Cerveras, which had left the Cape de Verde Islands on 29 April, managed to avoid the American fleet under Admiral Sampson, and succeeded in entering the harbour of Santiago on 19 May, whereupon it was promptly blockaded. A land attack from the other side was made on Santiago, and the Spanish fleet was forced to come out. With vessels that were foul and guns which were obsolete, the result was not long in doubt; the ships of the Spanish fleet were quite outclassed by the Americans, and in a very short time they were disposed of. The garrison of Santiago surrendered, and Spain sued for peace. Preliminaries were agreed upon at Washington, and after some tedious negotiations concerning the Philippines, a treaty was signed at Paris whereby, in consideration of a payment of four millions sterling, Spain relinquished to the United States her sovereign rights in Cuba, the Philippines, and Porto Rico. Thus ended the Spanish overseas Empire. The blow was a heavy one for Spanish pride, and there was some outburst of popular anger in an attempt to place the blame upon some one, especially the queen mother. But eventually the loss was recognized as a gain. Freed of the immense burden of her colonies, Spain could devote her whole energy to the consolidation of her internal resources, and better times were in store for her.

In 1902 the wise and prudent regency of Queen Maria Christina, whose virtues were recognized at home and abroad, came to an end, and the young king, Alfonso XIII, ascended the throne at the age of sixteen. By the death of the veteran Liberal leader, Sagasta, on 5 January, 1903, which broke up the Liberal party and the dissensions of the Conservative administrators, the country was thrown into considerable political unrest, which manifested itself in revolutionary outbursts in Barcelona and several of the larger cities. But it would be tedious to follow the varying fortunes of the ever-changing Ministries, and it must suffice to say that the conflict lay between the Clerical coterie round the king and the forces of advanced thought. The young king gradually emancipated himself from the court circle, and showed strong

tendencies of acting on his own initiative—a tendency which was further marked by his marriage with Princess Ena of Battenberg.

Moreover Alfonso gained on this occasion a great popularity by his bravery during the bomb attack made on him and his young queen on their wedding-day, and this popularity he has succeeded in maintaining. The anti-Clerical campaign continued with renewed force; the culminating point was reached in the passing of the Civil Marriage Law and Señor Canalejas' attempt to introduce an Associations Bill. In 1907 Señor Maura became Prime Minister for the second time, who, although a sincere Catholic, was moderate in his views, and desired the maintenance of order with the furtherance of popular progress. His administration, which lasted until 1909, marked a great advance in Spanish politics. In December he introduced his Local Administration Bill to increase the responsibility of local bodies, but the measure met with great opposition, and it was not passed until 1909. The Ministry of Maura seemed assured, but its downfall was caused by the Moroccan crisis. The rebellion of the Riff tribesmen made an increase in the army imperatively necessary. An insurrection of an extraordinarily savage nature broke out at Barcelona against "conscription", and by the destruction of church property assumed anti-Clerical proportions as well. The rebellion was quelled with great severity, and a ringleader was found in Ferrer, a well-known freethinker and conductor of anti-Clerical demonstrations. Ferrer was tried amidst scenes of great excitement, found guilty, and duly shot as a rebel. The Ferrer controversy is too recent and controversial for these pages, but it may probably be conceded that his execution was a political blunder. The effect was to promote the cause of anti-Clericalism, and the resignation of Maura became necessary. Meanwhile the Moroccan campaign was concluded, and Spain came out of the conflict with added powers in Morocco which are bound to add to her weight in the councils of Europe.

Señor Maura was succeeded by Señor Canalejas, the leader of the independent Radicals. Canalejas promptly embarked on a policy of what may be described as moderate anti-Clericalism, by which the powers of the clergy were curtailed and the number of religious orders permitted to remain in the realm was reduced. But, in spite of a considerable amount of ultramontane agitation, the relations between the Vatican and the Government remained correct.

II. PORTUGAL

Previous to 1861, when Dom Louis ascended the throne, there was some similarity between the fortunes of Spain and Portugal; for both countries had seen the horrors of civil war and the financial straits brought about by political corruption. With the accession of King Louis a period of comparative quiet set in, in which from a commercial point of view the nation made considerable progress; but internally there was little improvement in the material and moral state of the

mass of the people, and this unsatisfactory result, which is equally true of to-day as yesterday, must be attributed to the evils attendant on unscrupulous professional politicians and the frequency of ministerial changes.

In 1875 there was some friction with Great Britain with regard to Delagoa Bay, which has already been commented upon in the chapter on the "Partition of Africa"; but the point in dispute was settled in favour of Portugal by the arbitration of Marshal MacMahon, and the episode seemed closed. Unfortunately the award stirred Portuguese colonial ambition, and the country embarked on a scheme of territorial aggrandizement which conflicted with the interests of Great Britain. On Major Serpa Pinto invading British territory at the Shiré River in 1890, Lord Salisbury made strong representations to Portugal, but as these representations met with little heed, he was forced to issue an ultimatum, and back it by dispatching a British squadron to the mouth of the Tagus. There was considerable resentment felt in Lisbon at the humiliation offered to the national pride, which was vented in openly expressed dissatisfaction with the monarchy and a futile Republican rising.

In 1889 Portugal lost her Empire in Brazil, where a Republic was established, and in the same year the aged King, Dom Luiz, died. The result of the successful Republican rising in Brazil was to encourage the adherents of a Republic in Portugal. There was an organized Republican revolt at Oporto under Alves Veiga, which was easily quashed, but nevertheless the movement gained a considerable political impetus.

Dom Luiz was succeeded by his son, Dom Carlos, who was married to the Princess Marie Amelie de Bourbon, a daughter of the French claimant, the Comte de Paris. He was a man of extravagant habits, frequently anticipated his civil list, and was soon considerably in debt. With an outward show of peace, internally the nation was seething with discontent. The various rotative professional politicians continued to plunder the State, and, in spite of heavy taxation, the Budget year by year showed an increased deficit, till the financial rottenness was divulged in 1892 by the inability of the State to meet the interest of the foreign bondholders, with the result that a Council of foreign bondholders had to be set up in Lisbon to deal with the whole question. In 1895 parliamentary reform was attempted, and the Constitution was remodelled on more democratic lines. The privileges of the Upper House were curtailed by the abolition of hereditary peers, and in 1901 universal suffrage was introduced.

Nevertheless the national fortunes showed little sign of improvement, and in 1906 Dom Carlos took the extraordinary step of appointing João Franco as independent minister. João Franco was a man of upright and resolute character, and possessed of considerable wealth. Parliamentary government was suppressed and a clean administration was promised. Unfortunately the change brought no amelioration in the lot of the taxpayer; although Franco effected some retrenchment

He was forced to increase the pay of the army, and further, to aid the King, he had to connive at an arrangement by which the Royal debt of £150,000 to the Treasury was written off. The opposition to Franco increased, especially when the King made him Dictator and a rule of repression set in. A conspiracy was formed by the disappointed politicians. On February, 1908, while returning from a visit to Coimbra, the royal family, as they were driving from the landing-stage to the palace, was attacked by a band of assassins. The King and Crown Prince were killed immediately, Prince Manuel was slightly wounded, while Queen Amelie escaped miraculously. Franco fled from the country, and the monarchy was doomed. An attempt was made to rally round King Manuel and constitutional government, but the young King did not possess the personality for such a desperate cause. The situation was handled flabbily, and no attempt was made to discover the plotters of the recent murders. In October, 1910, the revolution broke out. In a single night the monarchy was overthrown and the Republic proclaimed. A provisional government was formed under Professor Braga with Costa as Minister of Justice.

Costa proceeded to act with great brutality towards the religious orders, and the new regime was inaugurated by a distinct cleavage between Church and State.

So far the Republic has experienced troubled times; but in spite of sporadic Royalist revolts it still seems to be stronger than its enemies.

PART V

The Powers Outside Europe

CHAPTER XVIII

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The conclusion of the Civil War between the North and the South, which had ended in the triumph of the Union, left a host of questions that had to be solved before the work of reconstruction could be said to be accomplished. The chief problems were the deplorable state of the population of the South, who had staked their all on the war and had lost; the future of the four millions of negroes so recently emancipated; and the founding of a legal federal system—"the Federal Constitution made no provision for secession or restoration; and the powers of the central government over the conquered communities, which from the necessities of the case ought to be as wide as possible, were left to be inferred from a few meagre clauses open to various interpretations".¹ Further, there was the financial problem to be faced, caused by the ruinous cost of the war and the taxation necessary to defray the same.

Owing to the difference of opinion between the first President, Lincoln, and his successor, Johnson, and the prominent political leaders of the North, there was a delay of six years before a fixed policy for the reconstruction of the South got into working order. It became a question of the leniency to be shown to the Southerners. Lincoln and Johnson were in favour of the greatest possible amount of leniency, thereby hoping that the South would soon forget its wounds; since they were of the opinion that the Southern States by their secession had not necessarily forfeited their constitutional status, and that a generous amnesty would restore to them their rights. On the other hand, the extremists of the North, such as Sumner and Stevens, held the view that by their acts the Southern States had violated the constitutions and were at the free disposal of the Government of the Union. The assassination of Abraham Lincoln had raised the Vice-President, Andrew Johnson, to the chief office in the State; but Johnson unfortunately lacked the kindliness and tact of Lincoln. In

¹ *The Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VII, p. 623.

spite of a belligerent presidential address Johnson immediately identified himself with the prudent policy of Lincoln, and began to form new governments in those States whose citizens had taken the oath of allegiance,¹ equal to one-tenth of the voters of 1860; even before Lincoln's death Virginia, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Arkansas had obtained governments by these means. Consequently on Johnson continuing the process, all the Confederate States, with the exception of Texas, had obtained constitutions before the meeting of the Congress in December, 1865. The work of reconstruction had begun; the governments of the South were endeavouring to deal with the surrounding chaos, and especially the negro problem. Unfortunately President Johnson's reconstitution of State governments was viewed with suspicion, and even hostility, by the men of the North; the conditions which prevailed between the whites and the blacks, entailing as they did the formation of a white militia, caused considerable alarm to the Union leaders, who feared further Southern disaffection and negro disabilities. Consequently when Congress met in December, 1865, the majority determined to question the Johnson reconstruction, which they regarded as flagrantly unconstitutional. The President and Congress were soon at loggerheads, Johnson denouncing the Republican leaders as traitors. Congress proceeded to pass a Bill continuing the Freedmen's Bureau, and this the President vetoed, whereupon Congress passed the Civil Rights Bill over the President's head, whereby the freedmen (i.e. negroes or ex-slaves) were conceded the same civil rights as the whites. In June, 1866, the committee on reconstruction which had been appointed by Congress brought out its report and amendments, which practically declared that the Southern States had forfeited their rights and pronounced upon the illegality of the Johnson governments. But a further Bill provided "that any State ratifying the amendment should be restored to representation".

The Congressional elections which followed were fought with great keenness, and ended in a victory for the Congressional party. The reply of the Southern States was to reject the fourteenth amendment and refuse the offer of Congress. A deadlock was the result. The Radicals promptly replied by forcing through Congress a series of Reconstruction Acts which placed the South under military government in five districts, while the existing civil governments were declared provisional only, and negro suffrage was granted. Congress then proceeded to pass a law called "Tenure of Office Act" to limit the executive power of the President. The debates in Congress ceased to be academic and were waged in fury. In March, 1868, the Republican leaders attempted to impeach President Johnson for removing General Stanton in defiance of the Tenure of Office Act. The Senate, however, by one vote only, refused to convict him. The reconstruction of the South on military lines progressed rapidly; but the prospects of the Radicals were growing weaker owing to the unpopularity of their finance. In 1868 occurred the presidential election, and the Republican

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VII, p. 625.

National Convention when it met in June unanimously chose General Grant as their nominee, while the Democrats pinned their faith on Governor Seymour of New York. But the reconstruction of Republican strength in the South and his personal popularity brought out Grant at the head of the poll.

The Republican party had triumphed, and at once set about completing its scheme of reconstruction. A fifteenth amendment was proposed for the security of the negroes, prohibiting the denial of suffrage on account of "colour" or "previous servitude"; moreover the acceptance of this amendment was made compulsory for the three States still outside the Union—Mississippi, Virginia, and Texas—as well as the State of Georgia, which was under a process of reconstruction for the third time. Georgia proving somewhat recalcitrant, a military government was resorted to till she chose to ratify the amendment. With some difficulty this fifteenth amendment became law on 30 March, 1870, and the formalities of Republican reconstruction were complete. The financial position was next defined, which was rendered necessary by the popular misgiving with regard to the paper money or "greenbacks", and the United States pledged themselves to redeem the notes "at the earliest practicable period". Further, the internal taxation was reduced, and the public debt of the Southern States was upheld. In 1871 the Republican party remedied a great scandal in purifying the Civil Service by throwing open the appointments to competitive examination.

Several important foreign questions now received settlement which had been open for some time. Treaties were concluded with China and Germany, but more serious questions required adjusting with France and Great Britain. The intervention of Napoleon III in the affairs of Mexico, infringing as it did their cardinal Monroe Doctrine, had caused great irritation in the United States, as it was felt that, inasmuch as the foreign policy of the Union was weakened by Civil War, the action of Napoleon had been provocative. However, the Foreign Secretary, Seward, kept his head, and the necessity for recalling the French troops to Europe after the Prussian victory of Sadowa to all intents and purposes closed the incident. The differences between the States and Great Britain concerning the *Alabama* claim, the San Juan boundary, and the Newfoundland fisheries were not so easy to adjust. But inasmuch as a special chapter has already been devoted to this subject it need not detain us here. As we already know, an Arbitration Court which, after much weary negotiation, was ultimately held at Geneva awarded damages against Great Britain for over fifteen million dollars, while the arbitration of the German Emperor proved also unfavourable to the British claim to the north-west boundary. Apart from these incidents, which were really outstanding, the immediate foreign policy of the Republican party was marked by restraint. The Senate refused to ratify a proposed purchase of the Danish West Indies and San Domingo, and Grant's administration kept its head during the Cuban insurrection of 1871, even during the unpleasant *Virginian* affair. Moreover, even

an attempt in that year to acquire concessions to enable the building of the Panama Canal met with very little enthusiasm, and the proposal to purchase Alaska from Russia was almost defeated.

In spite of a distinct reaction against the "controlling" Republicans—those iron-willed men of the North who were responsible for the severities of the reconstruction of the South—at the presidential election of 1872 General Grant was once more elected. Grant owed his election to his unshaken popularity with the masses and the absurd antics of his opponent, Horace Greeley, the brilliant editor of *The New York Tribune*. Although Grant was elected by an overwhelming majority, the Republican cause was losing ground in the South, where the effects, especially with regard to the negroes, of the reconstruction policy were beginning to be felt. The chief cause of misrule in the South must be attributed to the "carpet-baggers", who had obtained the control of the negro vote. The term "carpet-bagger" designated a resident of the North who was in many cases a mere adventurer, and always an ardent Republican or Radical. "One and all were imbued with an intense partisanship which shrank from nothing that would advance the cause of the Republican or Radical organization."¹ The result was an immense amount of corruption—the multiplication of offices, bribery, injustice, and increased taxation.

The older white population in disgust united to put down "carpet-bag" rule. The secret society "Ku Klux Klan" sprang into being, whose work of terrorizing was mostly done at night; so that a virtual reign of terror was inaugurated in the South whenever elections were in progress. The Government was confronted not with the status of the freedman, but with the negro problem itself. Various measures, such as the "Ku Klux Klan Act" and the "Supplementary Civil Rights Act", were passed to prevent the intimidation of the negro at election times, but, in reality, to bolster up the "carpet-baggers". Troops were used to control Federal elections; but in spite of all these unscrupulous methods negro government made no progress and Republican reconstruction was a patent failure.

In 1873 a severe financial panic spread over the whole union, the result of abnormal industrial expansion and an outburst of reckless speculation, especially with regard to railways as exemplified by the failure of Jay Cooper of the Northern Pacific Railway. For five years the commerce of the nation suffered, and failures were numerous. Then followed the "Crédit Mobilier" scandal. The Crédit Mobilier had obtained the contract for the Union Pacific Railway, and it was discovered that many blocks of shares had been distributed among Congressmen and Ministers. This scandal, and evidence of fraud and corruption in the revenue offices, caused a great reaction against the Republicans in Congress.

The Democratic progress began to alarm the Republican leaders, so an attempt was made to reform the party before the presidential election of 1876. This election was highly critical, as a Democratic

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VII, p. 640.

president would, of course, mean a policy of reversal. An attempt was even made to induce General Grant to stand a third time, but eventually the Convention which met at Cincinnati nominated Governor Hayes of Ohio, a man of sound financial views. The Democrats put forward Governor Tilden of New York, a stout champion of reform, while the Independent National party nominated Peter Cooper. The election proved extraordinarily close and exciting; the candidates were equal at the poll without the votes of three "carpet-bag" States, South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana. The Republicans claimed the election by one vote, maintaining the Republican intentions of these States which were in transition from negro to white government. The situation was fraught with danger; but a compromise was effected whereby an Electoral Commission was formed composed of five members from each House and five judges of the Supreme Court. The result was that Hayes was elected by one vote; but, inasmuch as the Commission was represented by eight Republicans and seven Democrats, every question was decided by eight votes to seven! However, the Senate refused to overrule the decision, and the Democrats had to swallow their wrath.

The Hayes administration was chiefly devoted to Civil Service reform, an attempt to pacify the "white" leaders of the South by the withdrawal of the Federal troops which had been there since the Civil War, and the founding of the Monetary Commission concerning silver coinage which ended in the compromise of the Bland-Allison Act. When the presidential election of 1880 came round, neither Hayes nor Tilden wished to stand again. The Democrats, to the chagrin of the Republicans, refused to make the Tariff an electoral issue, and selected as their candidate General Winfield S. Hancock. After a considerable difference of opinion the Republicans chose General James A. Garfield of Ohio as an anti-Grant candidate, after Blaine and Sherman failed to come to an agreement. The new President was not a strong man, and was unable to control the differences in his party. He came into conflict with Conkling and Platt, the New York senators and the "bosses" of the "Stalwart" party, who wished to "dictate all appointments in the State". They resigned, but in spite of their heroics failed to secure re-election. The dispute was in progress when, to the horror of the nation, President Garfield was assassinated by a half-crazy youth, a Conklingite, who had been disappointed in seeking office. The President's place, in accordance with custom, was at once filled by the Vice-President, Arthur. Contrary to expectation—for as Vice-President he had been regarded a Conkling puppet—Arthur filled the higher office with tact and some distinction. The agitation against the corruption in office, known as the "Spoils system", continued, and Congress passed an Act to empower the President to establish a Civil Service Commission, thus throwing open the departments to competitive examination. Two important Acts followed, the Anti-Polygamy Act and, owing to the severe labour problem of the moment, the Chinese Exclusion Act. The Tariff question was reopened by the establish-

ment in 1882 of the Tariff Commission, which resulted in the passing of a Tariff Bill that lowered the duties in some commodities, but by raising them in others became protective in character. But it was no settlement of the question, and the matter was really slumbering till the next election, upon which issue both parties knew it must mainly be fought. The Republicans were more or less solid Protectionists; but the Democrats were divided in opinion, although they were quite willing to sink all internal differences if they were to be led to victory under the banner of Tariff Reform. But recently there had arisen among the Republicans an independent party who professed, it is true, the Republican creed, but who, disgusted with party methods, announced their intention of voting according to their conscience. This party subsequently became known as the "Mugwumps". Thus when the presidential campaign of 1884 was inaugurated, there was no definite cohesion in either party, except that good government and the Tariff were live issues; consequently the choice of Blaine as a candidate by the Republicans was not a happy one, for Blaine had been largely accused of corrupt practices. The Democrats acted up to their profession of fair dealings by selecting for their candidate Grover Cleveland, Governor of New York. The "Mugwumps" immediately went over to his cause. It was largely due to their defection from the Republicans that Grover Cleveland, after a closely and bitterly fought contest, was sent to the White House as the first Democratic President for a quarter of a century. Cleveland from the outset stood for the policy of clean government, especially in the matter of the Civil Service. This attitude caused him to become unpopular with those on his own side who were out for spoil, but he held firm by his maxim that "public office is a public trust".

About the year 1880 the recovery from the financial slump of 1873 became very marked in the west and the south. The west obtained an amazing increase of population, and feverish railway activities took place, while the south shared as well in the general prosperity by the development of the cotton and mining industries. The effect of this industrial progress was to bring out huge corporations and syndicates for commercial development, and to concentrate the output into fewer hands, with the closing down of smaller undertakings and consequent labour distress. The result was that labour retaliated and formed combinations; the society known as "The Knights of Labour" being especially powerful, having a membership in 1886 of over three-quarters of a million. Strikes became very prevalent, and the sway of the Knights of Labour became almost anarchical. Fortunately the doings of the Knights outraged industrial common sense, and the society split up, being superseded by the more moderate American Federation of Labour. But one of the chief causes of discontent with the labouring classes was the enormous increase of Chinese cheap labour, which was aggravated by the fact that the Chinese immigrants retained their alien character and did not assimilate national institutions, to the grave danger of the State. Consequently Chinese immigration



GENERAL ULYSSES S. GRANT

1869-1877




Photo Underwood & Underwood

GROVER CLEVELAND

1893-1897



WILLIAM McKINLEY

1897-1901



Photo Underwood & Underwood

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

1901-1908

PROMINENT PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

was forbidden by Act of Congress for ten years, and in 1888 the Chinese were excluded permanently from the Pacific States.

In 1886 the fisheries controversy with regard to the rights of American fishermen in the eastern waters of British North America, better known as the Newfoundland Fisheries dispute, again broke out acutely. The matter has already been touched upon, so it need not detain us here. Suffice it to say that the fisheries had been more or less worked in the spirit of the Treaty of Washington of 1871. But on 1 July, 1885, the fishery articles were denounced by the United States, although, as a result of negotiation with the British Legation, the American fishermen continued to enjoy their old privileges pending discussion at a joint commission. This recommendation was refused by the Senate in 1886, and several unpleasant international episodes followed through the seizure of American vessels. Eventually a convention met at Washington in November, 1887, which ended in the Bayard-Chamberlain Treaty of 15 February, 1888. This treaty, however, was not ratified by the Senate, and a system of fishing by Canadian licence prevailed till the settlement of the Alaska Boundary Dispute in 1903.

This fishery dispute caused some excitement throughout the States, which was, however, swept aside by the intense interest manifested in President Cleveland's address on the Tariff question. Cleveland denounced the excessive taxation, for which he held the existing laws responsible because of their artificial character. The President then demanded a revision of the Tariff in order to reduce revenue; in other words he stood for Tariff Reform. The Mills Bill was passed, by which several commodities were released from duties. The issue between the two parties was now clearly defined. "Although the performance of the Democrats in the passage of the Mills Tariff Bill by the House in 1888 showed in fact no strong leanings towards free trade, the Republicans were able to force a campaign on the 'American doctrine of protection for labour against the pauper millions of Europe'."¹

The Republicans passed over Blaine, indisputably the most brilliant man of the party, and selected Benjamin Harrison of Indiana; while, of course, Grover Cleveland sought re-election. The cry against Tariff Reform was sufficient to carry Benjamin Harrison by a small majority. Harrison appointed Blaine as Secretary of State, and a future President, Theodore Roosevelt, became President of the Civil Service Commission. The Harrison administration is chiefly remarkable for the Samoan question with Germany. A conference, which had been adjourned, was approaching a settlement of the dispute, when the German Government in 1888, without previous warning to the Powers, demanded reparation from the Samoan king, Malietoa, for alleged wrongs really committed before the conference. The result, after some diplomatic trifling, was an absurd state of war declared by Prince Bismarck against Samoa, and German representations were made to the United States complaining of American interference on the side of the natives. The situation grew

¹ Charles A. Beard's *Contemporary American History*, p. 103.

ugly, and a martial spirit prevailed throughout the States which resulted in an increased vote for the navy. Seeing the trend of events Prince Bismarck prudently proposed a resumption of the congress, and after certain conditions to rule the procedure had been stipulated, the representatives of Germany, Great Britain, and the United States met at Berlin on 29 April, 1889. This congress recognized the equal rights of the three Powers and the autonomy of the islands. The arrangement, however, proved unsatisfactory, and a further conference ten years later, in 1899, granted to Germany sole control of the chief islands Savaii and Upolu, while the eastern islands and Tutuila fell to the United States. Great Britain retired altogether in exchange for German concessions in the Friendly and Solomon groups. This Samoan incident is interesting, as it shows the awakening of the United States from the domestic effects of the Civil War, and their desire for a strong foreign policy. The most important pieces of legislation of the Harrison regime were the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 to prevent combinations to the detriment of healthy competition. The effects of the Act were negligible, for companies soon found a way of evading the law. "Seven of the eight judicial decisions under the law during Harrison's administration were against the Government, and no indictment of offenders against the law went so far as a trial. During Cleveland's second term the law was a dead letter. Meanwhile trusts and combinations continued to multiply."¹ The other Sherman Act, known as the Sherman Silver Purchase Act, carried even more controversy. This Act "authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase each month 4,500,000 oz. of silver at its market price, and to pay for it in Treasury notes redeemable, at his discretion, in either silver or gold". Again this Bill was unsatisfactory in achieving its object, "but was a measure of compromise, designed to prevent the defection of 'Silver' republicans, as well as the passage, with the support of the members of both parties, of a Bill for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1".² Another important Act of the Harrison administration was the McKinley Tariff Act, which largely increased the duties on imports. The immediate result was a large increase in prices and the cost of living, which, occurring on the eve of the Congressional elections of 1890, resulted in a severe Republican set-back. Otherwise Harrison's presidency was uneventful and uninspiring. He was quite inconspicuous politically, and in the second contest with Cleveland in 1892 was easily defeated. The most outstanding event in the election was the enormous number of votes, amounting to a million, obtained by the Populist candidate. The Populists demanded government by the "plain people", and ascribed the condition of the nation to capitalist oppression.

President Cleveland's administration started on a wave of business prosperity that was more apparent than real; for in 1893 occurred a disastrous commercial panic which brought immense ruin in its train. Failures occurred on every side, many railways fell into the hands of

¹ Charles A. Beard's *Contemporary American History*, p. 137.

² *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VII, p. 668.

receivers, and public works were at a standstill. Strikes broke out all over the country, the worst of which, the Pullman strike of Chicago, resulted in the paralysis of the railway system of that city, and led to such mob violence that United States troops had to be sent from Washington. The immediate effect of the panic was to draw attention to the Silver problem, which had been a menace for fifteen years. During the last three years the gold coin and bullion at the Treasury had dwindled by more than \$132,000,000 and the silver coin had increased by more than \$147,000,000. Cleveland summoned a special session of Congress for August, and asked for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, which was promptly granted by the House of Representatives, although it occasioned a protracted dispute in the Senate, to the paralysis of business. The President then turned his attention to the revision of the Tariff, and the Wilson Bill was the result. The new Bill adopted the principle of *ad valorem* instead of specific duties, while the free list was largely extended. The loss of revenue was provided for by an income tax, which was subsequently declared by the supreme Court to be illegal. In the Congressional elections which followed in 1894 the Republicans carried all before them. Meanwhile the financial distress increased, and the difficulties of the Government became worse by the falling off in the revenue. Cleveland then had recourse to selling Gold Bonds on favourable terms to protect the reserve. The first two issues were taken up by the bankers, and the third was over-subscribed by the country. A further issue of Gold Bonds in 1896 was again well taken up by the public. So President Cleveland had amply protected the Treasury.

In foreign affairs the second Cleveland administration is remarkable for the Venezuela Boundary dispute with Great Britain and the annexation of Hawaii. The Venezuela dispute has already been discussed in another section of this book, so we can pass over it here; but it should be noted that the full significance of the event lay in the wide interpretation placed by the United States on what is known as the Monroe Doctrine, and the recognition of the principle of arbitration in all matters of dispute between Great Britain and America.

The presidential election of 1896 was fought entirely on the currency question. The Republicans nominated William McKinley and declared for the gold standard against the free coinage of silver, and, although they lost support in the Silver States, they gained over Democratic financiers. The Democrats found a mighty champion in William J. Bryan, who superseded the old leader on the Silver question, Richard P. Bland. Bryan was further endorsed by the Populists. A secession of Democrats, known as the Cleveland men or the "Gold Democrats", nominated for President General J. McC. Palmer of Illinois. The election was carried on under the greatest excitement, chiefly due to the fiery personality of Bryan. However, the eloquence of the Silver candidate was powerless against the financial forces arrayed against him. The result was a magnificent triumph for the Republicans, and President McKinley was inaugurated on 4 March, 1897. The first action

The Powers Outside Europe

of the new President was to convene a special session of Congress, when the Dingley Tariff was enacted. By this Act duties were raised enormously and the free list was modified. The victorious party then followed with the Gold Standard Act, whereby the gold dollar was adopted as the unit of value, and a gold reserve of \$150,000,000 was maintained.

The presidency of McKinley marks the definite embarkation of the American people on a policy of expansion abroad and of a vigorous foreign policy. McKinley had been handed on from his predecessor the legacy of the Cuban insurrection, and he early entered a protest with Spain against her policy in Cuba which at the moment was being directed by the "Butcher", General Weyler. Apart from the natural sympathies of a free people for a people struggling for their liberty, the financial interests of Americans in the island were enormous, over fifty million dollars being invested in Cuban business, and American commerce with the island amounted to a hundred millions annually. The Americans desired war, and a war fever spread throughout the States. "Congress was impatient for armed intervention, and fretted at the tedious methods of diplomacy. Spain shrewdly made counter-thrusts to every demand advanced by the United States, but made no outward sign of improvement in the affairs of Cuba, even after the recall of General Weyler."¹ With the loss of the *Maine*, which had ostensibly been sent on a pacific mission to Havana, it was impossible to curb the martial spirit of the people any longer. A certain diplomatic correctness was preserved, but there was no mistaking the warlike character of President McKinley's message of 11 April, 1898, and war was declared on the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington. The operations of the war, which was mainly naval in character, need not concern us here, as we dealt with it in the chapter on Spain. By the Treaty of Paris (10 December, 1898) Spain relinquished her American possessions, and Cuba came under the temporary occupation of the United States pending its complete independence, while Porto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines were ceded outright to the United States, in consideration of a cash indemnity.

On the publication of the terms of peace a violent controversy broke out through the United States on account of the retention of the Philippines, and the Southern statesmen taunted the Republicans with insincerity on the race question. The treaty was ratified on 6 February, 1899, and America became immediately recognized as a world power; the policy of imperialism had begun. The effect of this policy was very soon to be felt in the necessity for the United States to interfere in China during the Boxer insurrection. A revolt against American rule broke out almost immediately in the Philippines under Aguinaldo which was not completely quashed until the spring of 1902. Some complications occurred with regard to the form of government in Porto Rico, but eventually by the Foraker Act (1900) it was decided that the Porto Ricans were not full citizens of the United States, but

¹ Charles A. Beard's *Contemporary American History*, p. 204.

were under American protection, and a tariff was imposed, for home protection, upon the sugar industry.

The recent events of expansion provided the Democrats with a cry in the presidential election of 1900, and the Republicans were accused of a policy of "Imperialism". Mr. McKinley was once more nominated by his party, and Mr. Bryan again came forward as the Democrat champion, with undiminished faith in "free silver". In spite of the defection of some Republican veterans, who were disgusted with the imperial tendencies of the party, Mr. McKinley was elected President by an increased majority, while Mr. Roosevelt became Vice-President. President McKinley had scarcely embarked on his second term of office when he fell a victim to an anarchist's bullet while attending the Buffalo exhibition, 14 September, 1901, and was succeeded by Theodore Roosevelt, the Vice-President. Mr. Roosevelt provided a violent contrast to Mr. McKinley, who was not a strong man, with a lack of imagination which prompted him to follow rather than to lead. Mr. Roosevelt, on the contrary, was a born leader of men, with exalted notions as to the duties of a President. It may safely be said that his terms of the presidency were the most remarkable since the days of Lincoln, and that during his regime America gathered prestige abroad. In foreign matters Roosevelt was called upon to settle the Venezuela affair, resulting from the blockade formed by Great Britain, Germany, and Italy to enforce the payment of that State's debts; and to take part in the expedition to Peking subsequent to the Boxer rising, when he protested strongly against the Russian claims. At the end of the Russo-Japanese War the President was instrumental in bringing about the Treaty of Portsmouth. The good relations that now existed between Great Britain and the United States, chiefly the result of the settlement of the Venezuelan dispute and the tacit British support given to America in the war with Spain, enabled the Foreign Secretary, John Hay, to obtain the recognition by Great Britain of the American rights to build the Panama Canal, which was formally ratified in the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1903. But the first Roosevelt administration will best be remembered by the President's vigorous Anti-Trust legislation; since, and in spite of, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 the trusts had multiplied marvellously in every form of commerce, of which the Standard Oil Trust and the Harriman and Hill Railway Combinations are the best examples. "The remedy he [President Roosevelt] proposed was publicity for corporate affairs, the regulation, not the prohibition, of great combinations, the elimination of specific abuses such as over-capitalization, and Government supervision."¹ Consequently President Roosevelt fearlessly attacked, in 1902, the Northern Securities Company, compelled an enquiry into the Post Office and Land Office administrations in 1903 which revealed a great fraud, and forced the Elkins Law (1903) to increase the powers of the Inter-State Commerce Commission.

The election of 1904 confirmed Mr. Roosevelt's popularity, which

¹ Charles A. Beard's *Contemporary American History*, p. 257.

The Powers Outside Europe

the powerful combinations arrayed against him were unable to undermine. Mr. Bryan stood down as a candidate, and the Democrats nominated Judge Alton B. Parker of New York, who dropped the free silver cry. The result of the election was a great triumph for Mr. Roosevelt. The most outstanding features of his second administration are his mediation between Russia and Japan, and the passing of the Hepburn Act in 1906. But if the Russo-Japanese disagreement was ended by the Treaty of Portsmouth, fresh difficulties were to crop up by the rapid influx of Japanese into the Pacific States, especially in California, to the apprehension of the natives; and State enactments were made against the Japanese which might have had the gravest consequences but for the personal popularity of Roosevelt. The fleet was sent round to the Pacific, ostensibly as a preliminary to a voyage round the world, and on calling at Japanese ports was received with cordiality. Apart from the Japanese immigrant the Government began to be alarmed at the rapid increase of undesirable aliens, with the result that the Immigration Act was passed in 1907, raising the financial position of the immigrant and making a knowledge of English compulsory. The Hepburn Act, mentioned above, increased the number of the Interstate Commerce Commission to seven, and extended the sphere of its activities to such undertakings as pipe lines, express companies, and sleeping-car companies. Moreover published rate schedules were required.

In 1907 occurred a severe financial panic owing to unsettled business conditions, possibly contributed to by the radical declamations of the President himself, especially in the stock markets. An attempted banking combination promoted by F. Augustus Heinze and Charles W. Morse collapsed, followed by the failure of the Knickerbocker Trust Company. The crisis was brought to an end by the Government's intervention in adding to the money supply and by the co-operation of Mr. Pierpont Morgan, the famous Wall Street financier. This crisis undoubtedly proved a set-back to Mr. Roosevelt's popularity, as his policy was now openly opposed by the Wall Street interests. The last beneficial measure proposed by the retiring President was the calling together of a State Congress to consider the necessity of the conservation of natural resources.

Mr. Roosevelt refused to be nominated in 1908, but succeeded in forcing his nominee, Mr. William H. Taft, on the Republican Convention. Mr. Bryan stood again for the third time in the Democratic interest. The election proved another triumph for the Republicans, and Taft became President by a majority of 159. During the election a rift in the Republican party had become evident. A secession had taken place of those disgusted with the "bosses" and desirous of a revision of the Tariff, and its adherents calling themselves "Progressive Republicans" were generally known as "insurgents".

In March, 1909, the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act was passed, although it was bitterly opposed by the insurgents from the West. Mr. Taft then proceeded to pass a measure for the creation of a Court of Com-

merce to be above the Inter-State Commerce Commission, and to establish a post-office savings system, to be followed by a system of parcels post. Meanwhile the insurgents had joined hands with the Democrats to pass their legislation. Consequently the influence of Mr. Taft with his party became undermined, especially in the matter of his supposed obstruction of Roosevelt's "Conservation" policy. When Mr. Roosevelt returned from his big-game expedition to Africa in 1911 he more or less identified himself with the insurgents, and openly criticized President Taft's administration. The close of Mr. Taft's administration was clouded by his failure to secure reciprocity with Canada, and by the Mexican troubles subsequent to the overthrow of President Diaz. In the election of 1912 the split in the Republican party was too pronounced to be repaired. Mr. Roosevelt tried to consolidate the insurgents, Mr. Taft stood on the old Republican platform, but by now he was a confessed opponent of Mr. Roosevelt, and the result was a phenomenally sweeping victory for the able Democratic candidate, Dr. Woodrow Wilson.

CHAPTER XIX

MODERN JAPAN

The last fifty years of the nineteenth century produced many historical surprises—the German Empire, Italian unity, the Balkan League, to mention a few—but no greater surprise than the amazing rise of Japan from a state of mediæval and Eastern feudalism to the position of a great Power, and, because of her strength and resources, of being deemed worthy to be the ally of Great Britain. For centuries Japan had been known to the nations of the West as an unapproachable and inhospitable land, owing to the repressive measures taken against foreigners by its despotic rulers. In the sixteenth century the islands were visited by Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and English traders, who at the time were received with welcome. Christianity was introduced by the heroic Jesuit, St. Francis Xavier, and the religion of the Cross spread with extraordinary rapidity; but unfortunately the mutual jealousies of the rival Christian sects which followed upon the Catholic mission, and the suspicion that the missionaries were using their influence for worldly purposes, led to a revulsion of feeling, and a cruel persecution of the Christians took place. The missionaries were expelled as well as the traders, and only a handful of Dutch merchants were allowed to remain under humiliating conditions, although the profits they made were enormous. Japan returned to her seclusion, and not only were foreigners forbidden to approach her shores, but the inhabitants themselves were forbidden to travel to foreign parts. This policy of seclusion was maintained for over two hundred years—during which time, it is true, there were secret aspirations for liberty and a

fuller national life—when it came to an abrupt end with the arrival of the American fleet, commanded by Commodore Perry, in the Bay of Yedo in 1854. From that moment the old order of things was doomed. The Japanese were powerless to resist the masterful American demands for the right of trading in the islands, and a treaty had eventually to be concluded with Perry, the first treaty ever signed with a Western power. The American success was, of course, the signal for interference on the part of the chief European nations, and “treaty ports”, on terms which subsequently proved derogatory to the national dignity, had to be granted, either immediately or subsequently, to the British, French, Germans, Spanish, Russians, and Dutch, while diplomatic envoys were permitted to take up their residence in Yedo, later to be known as Tokyo.

Such violent changes could not take place without bloodshed. Great excitement prevailed and discontent at the introduction of the hated foreigners, and a civil war of great bitterness broke out, which was not finally quelled until 1868. The immediate result of the conflict was the abdication of the Shogun and the abolition of the strange dual government by which the real power lay in the hands of the Shogun, strictly the “Mayor of the Palace”, while the emperor or Mikado was forced to wrap up his right to actual authority in the attributed divinity of his office.

With the restoration of the emperor's authority begins the era of new Japan. The Emperor Mutsu Hito, who had succeeded the Emperor Komei in 1867, was only fifteen years of age, but gave evidence of an independent character. His advisers, to prevent the interference of the followers of the ex-Shogun, contrived to remove the troops of the Aizu clan from their duties as guards of the imperial palace and to substitute for them men of the Satsuma and other clans loyal to the *Daimyos*, who desired the imperial restoration. The result was that the ex-Shogun was persuaded by his followers to rise in revolt, and the rising was only quelled after severe fighting. In February, 1868, the emperor dramatically severed himself from the Japanese tradition of ages by addressing to the representatives of the foreign Powers the facts of the alterations of the new régime, and inviting them to a personal audience at Kyoto. For the first time in a thousand years foreigners were to be admitted to the sacred precincts of the imperial palace. Unfortunately the solemnity of the occasion was marred by a fanatical attack on Sir Harry Parker, the British representative, whose ability had largely contributed to the auspicious occasion. The court was profuse in its apologies, and strong precautions were taken to prevent the recurrence of such an incident. An imperial rescript was issued subjecting murderers of foreigners to the most condign punishment, which prevented the culprit from expiating his crime by the honourable method of *hara-kiri*. He was degraded socially, and this edict effectually put an end to fanatical outrages. To mark the changes of the new era the capital of the empire was removed from Kyoto to Yedo, whose name was changed to Tokyo (eastern capital). Before national unity could be obtained it became

obvious that feudalism must be abolished, and this was accomplished by the voluntary relinquishment by the *Daimyos* of the chief provinces of their hereditary privileges, a course which was followed by the surrender of the lesser *Daimyos*. "In response to these memorials a decree was issued by the emperor, 7 August, 1869, announcing the abolition of the daimiates, and the restoration of their revenues to the imperial treasury. It was also decreed that the ranks of court nobles (*kugés*) and of *Daimyos* be abolished, and the single rank of *kwazoku* be substituted."¹

In place of the daimiates the government created prefectures, which at first were vested in the *Daimyos*, but were soon thrown open to general talent. But it was some little time before the financial question involved in the suppression of the feudal system could be solved, especially the amount of income to be granted to each *Daimyo* in lieu of surrendering his fief, and the compensation to be given to their feudal retainers, the *Samurai*. Eventually most of the pensions to the *Samurai* were compounded for by lump sums, an arrangement which may have been beneficial to the state but not to the *Samurai* themselves. "In many cases worry and disappointment, and in others poverty and want, have been the sequels which have closely followed the poor and obsolete *Samurai*."²

In 1874 occurred Japan's first foreign adventure under the restored empire. It was not a particularly brilliant or hazardous undertaking, but interesting as helping to define the relations between Japan and China. The affair concerned the Riukiu or Loo-Choo Islands, which had long been regarded as tributary to the Satsuma fief. Some of the Riukiu islanders had landed on the Island of Formosa, and had been treated with abominable cruelty by the inhabitants. Formosa was supposed to be under the sovereignty of China, and diplomatic representations were accordingly made to Peking, where they were received with contemptuous indifference. Thereupon a small Japanese force was landed in Formosa to punish the murderers, who were unable to put up an effective resistance. The Chinese promptly protested against this violation of their territory, and, but for the intervention of the British Minister at Peking, war might have broken out between the two empires. Eventually, China agreed to pay an indemnity to Japan, amounting to about £100,000, to cover her cost in the expedition. This success confirmed Japan in the belief in her right of possession of the Riukiu Islands, and they were accordingly formally annexed. China protested, and a meeting was held in Peking in 1880 to settle the question of a compromise; but the Chinese diplomatists withdrew on a plea of insufficiency of instructions, and the Japanese determined to retain their possession of the islands.

From earliest times in which Japan claimed a victory over Korea, the latter country was supposed to have acknowledged the suzerainty of the island empire, and some form of tribute had been paid intermittently. On the restoration of the empire the Mikado sent a letter to

¹ David Murray's *Japan*, p. 385.

² *Ibid.*, p. 387.

the Korean court to acquaint it of the change. The letter and the overtures of friendship it contained were received in such an insulting manner that the angry Japanese public clamoured for war. However, a war with Korea would have meant one with China, and for that the Japanese were not yet prepared. Korea was accordingly permitted to remain in her isolation—an isolation as exclusive as that of Japan before the Restoration. But the firing upon a Japanese gunboat by a Korean fort in 1875 afforded Japan the pretext for an interference she was now able to support by a show of force. Profiting by the lesson she had learned from Commodore Perry in 1854, the Japanese dispatched an armed expedition to induce the Koreans to enter into a treaty and abandon their exclusive policy. Powerless to resist, the Koreans signed a treaty with Japan according her “favoured nation” terms, and a contingent of Japanese troops was permitted to remain at Seoul, the Korean capital.

In the beginning of 1877 a great civil war broke out in Japan, generally known as the Satsuma rebellion, because its leaders belonged to the powerful Satsuma clan, which had been mainly responsible for the abolition of the office of Shogun and the restoration of the empire. But in spite of their great services to the state the Satsuma leaders were thoroughly conservative in their outlook and opposed to the modern innovations, especially to the growth of democratic tendencies. The chief leader of the rebellion was Saigo Takamori. For some time Saigo had been fostering the elements of revolution by the founding of military schools, and had gathered round him a devoted band of *Samurai* and students. Placing himself at the head of a force of 14,000 of these irreconcilables, he marched towards Tokyo, but was checked in his progress by the necessity of besieging the fortress of Kumamoto. This military necessity gave the government a much-needed breathing-space, and a strong force was collected under the command of Prince Arisugawa-no-miya. After a desperate conflict the prince succeeded in relieving the fortress, and the rebels fled towards the east coast. Several fierce encounters took place before the rebels were finally brought to bay at Nobeoka. Saigo himself escaped to Kagoshima, and, seeing that further resistance was useless, committed suicide by *hara-kiri*. Thus ended the last attempt to stem the tide of progress under the restored empire; moreover, the conflict taught the government the fact that they could rely on the loyalty of the official classes, and, further, that the masses could be trained into soldiers equally as well as the *Samurai*. “The rebellion was the first practical test of the men who have since proved themselves to be among the most formidable soldiers of the world, and of a military organization which has shown itself to be efficient and complete in every detail.”¹

After the rebellion was successfully quelled, an agitation broke out for a constitutional government in accordance with the first article of the oath taken by the emperor in 1868, and generally known as “The Imperial Oath of Five Articles”. This first article declared that

“Deliberative assemblies shall be established, and all measures of government shall be decided by public opinion”. As a matter of fact, the intention of this first article was excellent, but the government soon found out that the people, so lately freed from feudalism, were quite unfitted for representative institutions, and accordingly repressive measures were introduced to preserve the force of the central authority, with the result that riots and assassinations became frequent. There was a lull in the storm during the Satsuma rebellion, but, as we have just said, as soon as it was over the agitation broke out afresh. Okubo, the Minister of the Interior, was assassinated in 1878. Then, as if to test the national fitness for a constitution, local assemblies were established with some say in the administration of finance; but, although excellent as a means of political training, they did not satisfy the popular demand, so the agitation for more representative government continued. At last, in 1880, the emperor issued a rescript promising a national parliament for 1890, and the agitation ceased. Prince Ito was chosen by the emperor to prepare a constitution, and for several years wandered amongst the great Powers to gather from their methods what he thought suitable for his own requirements. A cabinet was formed, consisting of ten ministers of state, over whom Marquis Ito became the first Minister-President, and after four years of labour the new constitution was promulgated (11 February, 1889).

In his travels Marquis Ito had fallen to the fascination of Prince Bismarck, so the constitution was in main essentials based upon that of Germany, with the ministers responsible to the emperor. The result was that the opening years of parliamentary institutions were full of strife, owing to the discontent of the more advanced section, which was bitterly disappointed in its failure to obtain a constitution based on the British democratic model. The most important change was the establishment of a House of Peers on European pattern; for this purpose the ancient Japanese nobility was remodelled and the five orders of nobility—prince, marquis, count, viscount, and baron—were created, partly on an hereditary and partly on an elective basis. Consequently, Parliament, or the Imperial Diet as it is strictly called, consisted of two houses, the Upper, or House of Peers, consisting of 300 members, and the House of Representatives, eventually formed of 379 members.

We will now pass on to Japan's recovery of her national autonomy. After the success of Commodore Perry's mission in 1854, Japan signed treaties, in ignorance practically of their real significance, with most of the nations of the West, and these treaties all granted extraterritorial jurisdiction; that is to say, the Western nations formed their own consulates in the various treaty ports, and, ignoring Japanese laws, maintained a separate jurisdiction over their own citizens. As the regenerated empire increased in power and prestige this state of affairs was keenly resented as an insult to the national dignity, and Japanese statesmen soon made strenuous efforts to remove this anomaly. The great difficulty to be overcome was the fact that the Christian nations of the West never had permitted their subjects to be liable to Asiatic

justice; so, to obtain the recognition of Western culture, Japan must first remodel her laws. In 1871 a great embassy was sent to Europe with the object of obtaining a modification of the treaty terms from the chief Powers, especially of the obnoxious extritorial clauses. The embassy was absent from Japan for three years, and returned to Tokyo without gaining its direct object; but, inasmuch as the embassy had been composed of men of all degrees of public service, the time abroad had not been wasted. European institutions were closely studied, and far-reaching reforms were instituted—military, naval, and educational—all under Western instructors. But the most important reform of all was the preparation of a new code of laws, by which all the barbarities of the past were abolished, especially the prohibition of Christianity. "Every recommendation made by the embassy, every step taken on that recommendation, was influenced by the burning desire to procure the abolition of extritoriality."¹ But many years elapsed before the Japanese claims to complete autonomy were recognized. Two conferences were held at Tokyo, in 1882 and in 1886, under the presidency of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, at which all the representatives of the treaty Powers were present. At the first conference the wisdom and ability of the British representative, Sir Harry Parker, helped to smooth Japanese difficulties, so that at the second conference, although the full goal was not reached, agreements were arrived at which made a completion but a question of time. But the emperor and his advisers came to the conclusion that conferences of representatives *en masse* were tediously slow in results; therefore it was decided to treat with each Power separately and in Europe. Gradually Western opposition was worn down, and in 1894 a treaty was signed with Great Britain whereby the full Japanese claims were acknowledged. The other Powers slowly and somewhat sullenly followed suit; so that on 30 June, 1899, the emperor was able to announce a complete settlement to his gratified subjects. For the first time in history an Oriental state was recognized as on an equal footing by the Powers of the West. In spite of much pessimism in Europe at the time, the result of the step has been justified. Here and there judicial hardships prevailed, but in the main Japanese justice has been able to defend the foreigner, and the antagonism which his presence provoked in the native mind has completely vanished.

We will now return to Japanese foreign affairs. And this practically means the question of Korea; for from the very first moment of her regeneration, Japan recognized the menace of the propinquity of the Korean Empire, with its unstable government and the Russian designs of annexation. If Japan were not to be strangled in her growth she must prevent the preponderance of other Powers in Korea. After the treaty of 1876, by which, as we have seen, Korea agreed to give up her seclusion and ostensibly develop along Western lines, Japan was permitted to keep an envoy together with an escort in Seoul.

¹ J. H. Longford in *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, p. 543.



MUTSU HITO, EMPEROR OF JAPAN

(Died 1912, after reign of forty years)



PRINCE ITO

Japanese Statesman



KATSONOSKE INOUYÉ

(Son of Marquis Inouyé)

Japanese Ambassador, London (since 1913)



COUNT KOMURA

Japanese Statesman

.

.

.

Internally Korea was at the time divided into two camps, the progressives, who desired a closer union with the energetic, regenerated empire of Japan, and the conservatives, who were hostile to the Japanese and leant rather towards China and her ancient civilization. When the Japanese legation was built in 1880 the government of Korea was controlled by the conservative reactionaries, and the envoy's efforts at ingratiating were signally unsuccessful. In the summer of 1882 a mutiny broke out among the soldiers of Seoul, and at the instigation of the conservative ring-leader, Tai Won Kun, the Japanese legation was surrounded and burnt. The mission, with considerable difficulty and with heavy loss, managed to escape to the sea, where they were rescued by a British man-of-war and brought to Nagasaki. The news was received in Japan with a great outburst of anger, and war was with difficulty prevented. Korea made an appeal to China for protection, which was answered by the dispatching of a strong naval and military force; the Japanese also claimed a right to a garrison, and hostilities between China and Japan seemed imminent. Fortunately the Japanese demands were moderate—a reasonable indemnity and punishment of ring-leaders—and the danger was averted by their acceptance by the Koreans. The result, however, was the Korean recognition of Chinese suzerainty, and, inasmuch as the Japanese legation guard was allowed to remain in Seoul, the outlook for the future grew threatening.

These elements of discord smouldered for two years. During this period the Korean progressives, who had cemented their relations with the Japanese, in whom they recognized the saviours of their country, increased in power, and a conspiracy was hatched to overthrow the conservatives and the so-called Chinese suzerainty. A banquet was held in Seoul (4 December, 1884) to celebrate the opening of the new post office. During the repast an alarm of fire was raised, and, taking advantage of the confusion which prevailed, the conspirators seized the person of the king. The king—weak and irresolute—was persuaded to send an appeal to the Japanese embassy for assistance. Whether the Japanese minister connived at the plot will remain one of the secrets of diplomacy, but a Japanese guard was promptly dispatched and all the entrances to the palace were closely guarded. The progressive leaders promptly began to dispose of their conservative rivals in Oriental fashion, and a scene of hideous carnage ensued. The conservative survivors managed to send an appeal to the Chinese commander for assistance; the result was naturally a fierce conflict between the Chinese and Japanese, in which the Chinese were successful, and the conservative régime was restored. An anti-Japanese riot broke out in the streets of Seoul. Again the Japanese legation was burnt, and with consummate bravery the Japanese minister made his way to the coast. Again when the news reached Japan the war party was with difficulty suppressed by a prudent government. Count Inouyé was dispatched to Seoul, and Marquis (afterwards Prince) Ito repaired on a special mission to Peking to make representations concerning the Chinese

complicity in the recent *émeute*. Inouyé obtained full compensation from the Korean court; but the mission of Prince Ito proved more difficult, as the Chinese affairs were at that time under the masterful direction of Li Hung Chang. Eventually it was agreed that both Chinese and Japanese troops should be removed from Korea, but that both nations should have the right to restore them there if any emergency warranted the step. Moreover, the principle of Korean expansion was recognized.

In spite of considerable friction, owing to the continuation of the Chinese supremacy in Seoul, a truce was preserved for ten years. But the truce had produced no material benefit for Korea, which had practically made no progress in the period, and still suffered under the most inept and corrupt government in the world. In 1894 a revolution broke out among the people of southern Korea, with the avowed intention of removing the corrupt ministers of the king. The rebels at once prevailed, and the terrified government immediately sent to the Chinese Resident-General, Yuan Shi Kwai, for help. To do this without notifying Japan would be an infringement of the treaty of 1884; but Li Hung Chang relied on the parliamentary difficulties of Japan at the moment and a force of 3000 Chinese troops was landed at Asan. But Li Hung Chang had underrated Japanese patriotism. All political differences were sunk at once, and the nation presented a united front. The answer of the island empire was prompt and effective: 8000 troops were landed in Korea, and proceeded immediately to Seoul. A proposal on the part of Japan that she and China should be jointly responsible for good government in Korea was flatly rejected by the Chinese. Li Hung Chang hurried up reinforcements, and the transport, *Kowseling*, a British steamer, was dispatched from Tientsin with 1500 troops on board; but she was intercepted by the Japanese cruiser, *Naniwa*, and, refusing to surrender, was sunk with an appalling loss of life. On 25 July, 1894, war was declared between the two states. The space at our disposal prevents us from going into the details of this war. By the Western Powers the action of Japan in declaring war was regarded as sheer madness, so strong was the ancient tradition of the staying power and resources, even if cumbersome, of China. In the words of Captain Brinkly: "To worst her meant to leap at one bound to the hegemony of the Far East. That was the quickest exit from the shadow of Orientalism, and Japan took it." The Japanese obtained two easy victories by land in Korea, where the superiority of their Western-trained troops was very marked, and a successful engagement off the Yalu River at once gave Japan the command of the sea. The campaign was then transferred to Manchuria; this was so admirably conducted that within six months the mighty fortress of Port Arthur fell to Japanese prowess, and the victors were well on the way to Peking when China made overtures for peace. A peace was eventually signed at Shimonoseki, on 17 April, 1895; by its terms Japan gained the Liao-Tung Peninsula, with the fortress of Port Arthur, and Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, an indemnity of

200,000,000 taels, the fortress of Wei-Hai Wei in pledge for the payment of the indemnity, and the cession by China of all claims to a suzerainty over Korea.

The Japanese success seemed complete, but Chinese intrigue among some of the great European Powers had not been idle. Scarcely had the ratifications been exchanged when representatives of Russia, France, and Germany waited on the Japanese Foreign Minister, and represented, courteously but with unmistakable diplomatic firmness, that Japan should restore the Liao-Tung Peninsula. As has been already told in another section of this book, an allied squadron assembled in Chinese waters, and Japan had to bow to the inevitable. "Under the pretext of 'leasing', Germany seized Kiao-chau, and asserted her claim over the greater part of the Shantung province, and Russia practically annexed the Liao-Tung Peninsula; so that within four years of the time of her expulsion from the territories belonging to her by right of conquest, Japan saw those territories appropriated by the very Powers that expelled her."¹

Japan loyally stuck to her bargain: her troops were withdrawn from Korea and Manchuria, and the work of Korean regeneration was entrusted to Count Inouyé. The count's administration was brilliant and rapid in its show of improvement, when unfortunately his work was completely undone by Japanese complicity in the plot which led to the murder of the Queen of Korea, owing to which Russian influence was substituted for Japanese at the court of Seoul; moreover, Japan did not regain her ascendancy until she had successfully emerged from her war with the Power that had supplanted her.

Having once gained a foothold in Korea, Russia left nothing undone to consolidate her power, and Russian officials began to control every department of the state. To counteract those activities Japan sent to Korea a statesman of the first rank in Baron Kamura, who made various unavailing attempts to come to an understanding with the great Northern power. But Russian designs were not merely confined to keeping Japan out of Korea, they extended even to China, and by an adroitness unparalleled in history Russia succeeded in extracting, on a "lease", the very southern peninsula of Liao-Tung and the fortress of Port Arthur from which she had evicted Japan, who had gained them by right of conquest. Russia further gained the right to extend her trans-Siberian line through Chinese territory to Vladivostock and Port Arthur, with the highly important proviso that she might guard this line with her own troops. This wholesale filching on the part of Russia, and incidentally of Germany and France, roused the dormant patriotism of the Chinese, and the result was the anti-foreign Boxer riots, which led to wild excesses in the provinces of Shantung and Chili, with the danger to the European communities in Peking and Tientsin. Then followed the expedition of the great Powers to quell the rising, under the German generalissimo—Graf von Waldersee—in which the Japanese contingent came to the relief of the foreign legations

¹ Henry Dyer's *Japan in World Politics*, p. 63.

with a bravery and control in victory which won for them the admiration of the civilized world.

The result of this European interference, both with regard to her own and Far Eastern affairs in general, had stiffened Japanese resolution, and, warned by the set-back of 1894, she pushed on her naval and military preparations with great activity. Moreover, she cast about for friends in Europe. Mindful of the fact that Great Britain was the first power to recognize her autonomy, Japan very readily listened to the *pourparlers* for an alliance with Great Britain. The wisdom of such an alliance very soon became apparent to British and Japanese statesmen as the result of mutual interests in the Far East. The prime mover in the negotiations was Lord Lansdowne, and a treaty was signed by him and Baron Hayashi of a defensive and offensive character on 30 January, 1902. By the terms of the treaty the independence of China and Korea was recognized, though the right of interference in these countries was admitted, provided Britain or Japan found that their own national interests were at stake. "It was stipulated further, that if either Great Britain or Japan, in defence of their respective interests as above described, should become involved with another Power, the other will remain on strict neutrality, and use its efforts to prevent other Powers from joining in hostilities against its ally."

For two years Japan put up with the tortuous ways of Russian diplomacy, and then her patience gave way. War was formally declared on 10 February, 1904. We can pass over the campaign, as it has been fully described in the chapter on Russia. Japan emerged from the fray victorious but exhausted, and by the Treaty of Portsmouth her paramountcy in Korea was recognized. Moreover, she gained Port Arthur once more.

On 12 August, 1905, the alliance between Great Britain and Japan was renewed, in which the most important additions were clauses concerning the recognition of the policy of the open door in China and "the maintenance of the territorial rights of the High Contracting Parties in the regions of Eastern Asia and of India, and the defence of their special interests in the said regions". The wisdom of the alliance in the light of recent events has been more than justified, and the further agreements entered into between France and Russia in 1907 have been of incalculable value to the Allies during the course of the great World War.

After the war with Russia, conforming to a treaty actually made during the war, Prince Ito was dispatched as Resident-General to Seoul to control the foreign relations of Korea. But he was, like the Marquis Inoué before him, handicapped by his advisory position, which prevented him from enforcing his decisions. In July, 1907, the Emperor of Korea, who had reigned for forty years, was compelled to abdicate in favour of his son, and the powers of the Resident-General practically became supreme. Prince Ito at once set about a drastic system of reform, which was terminated by his assassination on 26 October, 1909, "and his great career came to an end, a career which, both in the

service he rendered to his country and in the world-wide reputation as a statesman, which it brought to him, is only paralleled in modern times by those of Lincoln, Bismarck, and Cavour".¹ All hope of a protectorate that should nominally preserve Korean independence was now at an end. On 29 August, 1910, Korea was formally annexed to the Japanese Empire, and the long and weary Korean question came to an end.

On 30 July, 1912, the Emperor Mutsu Hito died after a remarkable reign of forty years. His name for future historians will be that of the Emperor Meiji (enlightened government), and no better title could be conferred on him. In the course of a single reign to have succeeded to a realm groaning under an ancient feudalism and divided by a dual authority, and to have left it an up-to-date great World Power, is an achievement the romance of which will ring through the ages.

¹ Longford's *The Evolution of Modern Japan*, p. 134.

CONCLUSION

The Historical Causes of the European War

Our survey of the continental history of the last forty years is finished. We are now confronted with the result of all the international activities we have been describing, of the shuffling and re-shuffling of the diplomatic cards, and that—a European war of unprecedented magnitude and unheard-of ferocity. Our period began with the founding of the German Empire amidst the splendour of Versailles, the crushing of France and her isolation in Europe; it ends amidst the stricken battle-fields of Belgium and the pillaged towns and villages of that heroic land. That same German Empire is once more at war—not this time for the legitimate consolidation of her own unity, but on a wanton campaign of aggression which has isolated her, in due turn, in Europe, and has armed against her the most powerful coalition in the annals of the world. Let us look back and analyse the historical causes which have fatally contributed to such a calamity.

For the events which directly led to the war the reader is referred to Mr. Murray's Epilogue to Vol. IV. There he will find lucidly set forth the diplomatic situation which led to the rupture in the early days of August, 1914, for recent knowledge has thrown very little extra light upon that situation; the British Blue Book has been corroborated by the French Yellow Book and the Russian Orange Book, with some amplifications. But the revelations of public men have been able since those awful opening days to apportion German guilt and preparedness for war, and, above all, German designs upon the British Empire. In fact, as is ever the case, men have become wise after the event; the pieces of the Teutonic puzzle have been put together, and the whole picture of German designs and intrigue stands revealed to the public gaze.

Militarism and the dynastic supremacy of the Hohenzollerns have stamped the character of the modern German Empire from its inception. This significant fact manifested itself as far back as the year 1848, when a popular delegation offered the imperial dignity to King Frederick William IV of Prussia. The dignity was refused somewhat con-

temptuously; a King of Prussia, and a Hohenzollern, had no need of popular offers; should an imperial crown seem desirable, it would be won by the might of the victorious Prussian army. Thus when, in 1871, the tireless diplomacy of Bismarck—in spite of an awkward moment with the erratic Ludwig of Bavaria—obtained for his royal master the invitation from the German princes to become their Emperor, such an invitation was based on military necessity and conveyed no hope for German democracy. It was, in fact, the triumph of Prussianism and Prussian junkerdom, of whom Bismarck was himself the archetype. But Bismarck was a great genius, and he could afford to be a Junker.

The first ominous growls directed against Great Britain were even heard in 1871. The harsh terms imposed upon the French by the victors had evoked British sympathy, and the knowledge of this was received at Berlin with considerable irritation, so that the cult of "England the Enemy" may be said to date from that period, while the first British suspicions of Prussian methods were aroused by the part played by Prince Bismarck in the Black Sea designs of Russia. But the first actual European distrust of Germany begins in the year 1875, when it became obvious that the Prussian military party were eager to renew hostilities with France, being chagrined at her unprecedented recovery from the blows of 1870-1. Russia and Great Britain, as we have seen, prevented this crime, and a perfect storm of Anglophobia burst over the Empire. Bismarck was beside himself with rage and vented his spleen upon the unfortunate Crown Princess, to whom he attributed the origin of the famous letter of Queen Victoria to the aged Emperor William. From that moment the British policy of maintaining a strong France in Europe was declared, and as Russian interests lay in the same direction, the possibility of a Russo-British Alliance was demonstrated. In the words of Dr. Holland Rose: "The case of 1875 is well known in Germany. All public men, all newspaper editors are aware that, from 1875 onwards, it has been a maxim of Russian and British policy, that France shall not be suddenly taken at a disadvantage and crushed. In fact, the German Chancellor during his memorable interview with Sir Edward Goschen at Berlin, on 29 July, 1914, admitted that to be one of the cardinal points of British policy. The conclusion is obvious. We are bound to conclude that the German expressions of surprise at our intervention in this war are due either to unaccountable ignorance or to a flimsy pretence of ignorance."¹

The fact that the evidences of the marvellous recuperation of France in 1875 alarmed the military party at Berlin is conclusive proof, if proof were necessary, of the military character of the Peace of Frankfort. The terms of that Peace were harsh, and not dictated by the needs of the German nation as a whole, but by the requirements of the inner imperial autocracy which recognized the likelihood of a war of revenge. For a nation with peaceable intentions the retention of the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine was a blunder of the first magnitude. Prince

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Origins of the War*.

Bismarck himself recognized this fact, and was worried by the idea of keeping a purely French-speaking centre like Metz. Hence his policy of isolating France and diverting continental attention from Germany, in order that she might have some years of undisturbed peaceful development, by the creation of skilful alliances and colonial activities likely to produce mutual jealousies. Thus the great chancellor created the Three Emperors' League (*Dreikaiserbündniss*) in 1872, and when his Russian policy failed in 1878, he nevertheless utilized the opportunities of the Congress of Berlin to detach France from Europe by plunging her into the venture of Tunis; to thrust Austria into the Near East by handing to her the suzerainty of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and even to anticipate the British occupation of Egypt. The French, by the acquisition of Tunis, became estranged from the Italians, and the Triple Alliance was rendered possible.

With the attention of France diverted to North Africa, German policy would seem to have had a splendid opportunity of conciliating the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and by granting them some form of autonomy gradually to accustom them to the German yoke. The policy pursued was exactly the reverse; the Reichsland was never allowed to forget that it was a conquered province and was handed over to the Prussian drill-sergeant, with the result that those whose circumstances permitted, emigrated to France. "The population had dwindled, no fewer than 100,000 having emigrated to France. Metz had sunk from 50,000 to 30,000 inhabitants."¹ The spirit of militarism trod down the liberal aspirations of the men of the Reichsland, and it was hopeless to expect a display of geniality from Prussian officials. Consequently the state of affairs in the provinces fostered the French reaction which set in, towards the end of the year 1885, from colonial activities and, thanks to the outspokenness of the Radicals and the antics of General Boulanger, drove the nation into thoughts of patriotism and the dignity of its position in Europe. This is the moment of the first steps towards a *rapprochement* with Russia and the hopes of a war of revenge. The military settlement of Frankfort had left Germany a revengeful enemy on her western border, who was ready to seize the opportunity of an alliance with her neighbour in the East, already dissatisfied with Austro-German designs. Which brings us back to the Triple Alliance.

The forming of the Triple Alliance, originally based on a community of interests, and seemingly so conducive to the balance of power in Europe, that its inception was even hailed with praise by Lord Salisbury, developed into the huge provocative system of Pan-Germanism whereby the whole of Europe became an armed camp. But the Triple Alliance was but "triple" in name; it might be described as the insurance for Austria of the old Dual Alliance of 1879 against aggression from Italy. Italy, as events have proved, was merely a sleeping partner in the concern, which was predominantly Austro-German. In fact, she became a partner by necessity and not by a natural desire, gaining immunity from invasion for her more vulnerable frontier. In fact, "The

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Origins of the War*

Triple Alliance has been the grand cause of the present situation; not because such a grouping of the Central European Powers was objectionable, but because it has inspired over-confidence in the two leading allies; because they have traded upon the prestige of their league to press their claims East and West with an intolerable disregard for the law of nations."¹

We shall revert later to preponderance of Austro-German designs in the working of the triple partnership; and now it is time to examine some of the causes of British and German rivalries, whereby, in the opinion of Germany, a forward "welt-politik" became necessary. Apart from the innate jealousy of the German character, which professes to see in the British Empire an octopus-like power that is threatening to strangle Germany's legitimate expansion, there is the fact, as has already been noted, that Germany as a first-class power arrived late upon the scene; the colonial tit-bits of the world had been apportioned, and a goodly share of them were in the hands of the British. Consequently the adoption of a forward policy was bound in many ways and places to conflict with British interests.

The foundation of the German Colonial Society in 1882 marked the beginning of the Empire's policy of expansion. Previous to that year Bismarck had discountenanced colonial ambition; he was deeply intent on consolidating the resources of the Empire of his own creation, and considered that Germany was satiated with conquest. But the adoption of protection and the popular clamour for expansion forced him to acquiesce in a colonial policy. Moreover the opportunity was favourable, for the understanding with Austria had been arrived at, and Great Britain had her hands full in Egypt and in Central Asia.

The first designs of Germany to carve a colonial empire for herself at the expense of Great Britain were undoubtedly directed towards South Africa, where the Boer Republics offered the bait. The disaster of Majuba Hill had impressed German politicians with British vulnerability, moreover the Teutonic origin of the Boers provided a pretext for intrigue. Nor was that intrigue carried out half-heartedly. The activities of Herr Lüderitz at Angra Pequena Bay have already been noted, as well as the negotiations of Bismarck with the British Government, whose dilatory methods provoked him to fury. Count Herbert Bismarck, who was then stationed at London, was asked by Lord Granville if Germany had designs on the Transvaal from Angra Pequena. "Young Bismarck replied hotly: 'That is a question of mere curiosity . . . that does not concern you.' Of course it did concern us very nearly, and his display of temper was more illuminating than the fullest reply."² At any rate the colony of German South-West Africa was founded.

Then followed the St. Lucia Bay episode, with further activities on the part of Herr Lüderitz, and the Potsdam intrigue to purchase Delagoa Bay from Portugal—all designed to twist the tail of the British Lion.

¹ *Why We are at War*, by members of the Oxford Faculty of History.

² J. Holland Rose's *The Origins of the War*.

Thanks to the sagacity and resource of Sir Charles Warren, Germany was prevented from gaining Bechuanaland, where she would have proved an uncomfortable neighbour during the Boer War. The methods of German colonial policy were equally unscrupulous in Guinea and East Africa, as exemplified by the acts of Dr. Nachtigall and Dr. Peters, and but for the genuine desire of the British Government to foster German colonial aspirations, or rather participation in pioneer work in Africa when they did not directly clash with British interests, might have ended in unpleasant consequences. It is worthy of remark here that the German successes in Africa were obtained at a time when the German navy was an entirely negligible quantity.

German designs on South Africa became particularly marked about the year 1895, after the colonial activities in Brazil had been foiled by the Monroe Doctrine; the clashing of German with British interests dates from that time. The agents of the German Colonial Society redoubled their efforts in Pretoria, so that the British endeavours to redress the grievances of the "Outlanders" and remedy the state of misrule were continually checkmated by the secret work of these men. The persistent and almost insolent refusal of President Kruger to grant reforms can be accounted for by the faith he had in German support. In fact Oom Paul made no bones about his reliance on Germany; he publicly toasted the Kaiser, the titbits of the monopolies fell to the German financiers, and Dr. Leyds was dispatched to Europe to find friends against "perfidious Albion", and incidentally to purchase arms from Krupps.

The failure of the Jameson Raid, with the prompt disavowal of the British Government of any complicity therein, removed the danger of a German intervention on behalf of the Boers, although the Kaiser sent his famous telegram to Kruger which left a sting from which the proud British nation smarted for some time. Whether the Kaiser desired war at the time is an open question, but the circumstances of the unpreparedness of the German navy and the firm demeanour of France, now rapidly drawing her bonds closer with Russia, probably accounted for the wiser counsels which prevailed. At any rate the German cultivation of Boer friendship continued, and there is little doubt that the intrigues of the Prussian military gang precipitated the conflict. But if Kruger was rushed into provoking hostilities by his overweening confidence in German assistance, the sudden declaration of war equally upset the German plans. Germany wanted to interfere at her own time, but not at Oom Paul's convenience; moreover the German navy was not ready, and the Kiel Canal had not been deepened to permit the passage of the new type of *Dreadnought* battleship. The result was that Germany, with envy at her heart, had to preserve a strict neutrality and witness the splendid response of the British Empire, together with the rehabilitation of British prestige throughout the continent. The luckless Kruger repaired to Germany to upbraid his friends, and was unable even to obtain an audience from the Kaiser. "Why had the Boer Generals come to Germany, of all countries, in order to stir up

trouble? The events of October, 1914, supply the answer."¹ The result of the German impotence was vented in a piercing shriek of Anglophobia and feverish naval activity. To thinking men German designs against the British Empire were manifest. Again the German plans miscarried, for the war finished sooner than was expected, while the return of a Liberal Government to power, with avowed peaceable intentions and generous terms to the vanquished, banished reasonable pretexts of interference. But the activities of the armed peace were pursued more thoroughly; Great Britain realized in time the menace to the balance of power in Europe—a cardinal matter in British foreign policy—abandoned her "splendid isolation", and came to an understanding with France and afterwards with Russia.


The embarkation of Germany upon a policy of world expansion, in other words the rise to supreme power of the inner Prussian military party, dates from the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890 by the present Emperor William. Bismarck, to whose genius the German Empire founded on a military caste is really due, perceived the dangers ahead. He saw that Germany had built herself up by waging three successful wars, and had too many potential enemies. He wished at any rate to preserve the appearance of satiated ambition for some years more, and was loath to embark on an active colonial policy. But the methods of the mighty Bismarck were old-fashioned to the impetuous young Emperor and his advisers, and in the following year there blossomed forth that formidable institution—The All-German League. "The spirit which founded the League had, however, been active from the very morrow of the victories of 1870; and the present Kaiser had been captured by it long before he came to the throne. The membership of the League was at first small, and was confined to a few extreme men; but with each year of its existence it has grown, until at the present day it is believed to number something like half a million of the 'intellectuals' of Germany."²

The reader is by now familiar with the creed of Pan-Germanism, that, generally speaking, everything which is German, either in speech or origin, is to unite to dominate the world. The political result produced by the influence of this powerful league was to abandon the traditional friendship with Russia and still further to strengthen the bonds of Germany and Austria. From 1890 dates the undue preponderance of the Triple Alliance. Russia was jockeyed into the disastrous war with Japan, and Germany and Austria were free to develop their Pan-German schemes in the near East—a German Empire from Hamburg to Trieste, from Vienna to Salonika.

Another reason for the energetic forward policy of the German people is to be found in the teaching of the university professors, and especially in the enormous influence wielded by the deaf Professor of History in the University of Berlin, Heinrich von Treitschke, and to a certain extent in the Superman theories of Nietzsche. Indeed it is extraordinary how little known are the writings and sayings of

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Origins of the War*.

² C. R. L. Fletcher's *The Germans. What They Covet*. Oxford Pamphlets.



HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE

From a photograph



NAVAB SALAR JUNG BAHADUR,

FRIEDRICH WILHELM NIETZSCHE

From a photograph

the German professors in this country. The notes of warning are there, and the crass ignorance of the ordinary Briton concerning all things German, not to mention his indifference, must also be regarded as contributory to the causes of the war. Space prevents us from dwelling upon the subject of Treitschke; but, briefly, he preached the doctrine of might is right, and that the might has been given to the Germans, or rather the Prussians, the chosen people of God, who must impose their superior culture upon the world. The Germans are the most superior people in the world, and it has been only through their honest simplicity and the duplicity of their neighbours that they have been so long defrauded of their rightful heritage. To Treitschke the State is everything; the needs of the State must be paramount. "Two functions", says Treitschke, "belong to the State—the administration of law, and the making of war. It is war that is politics *par excellence*, and war therefore is the great function of the State. It is the great healer; it cannot be thought or wished out of the world, because it is the only medicine for a sick nation."¹ In other words, Treitschke loved the spirit of militarism: it was the lasting regret of his life that his infirmity had prevented him from becoming a soldier. And how Treitschke hated England!

"Almost the last time we see Treitschke, those noble features of his lit up, as they always were instantly lit up by any enthusiasm, whether of love or hate—almost the last time we really see him is on an evening in 1895, when, returned from a visit to England, he poured out to a company of friends all the vitriol of his scorn, antipathy, and hate for England and for the English, enduring no word of comment or contradiction. . . . But all who listened to Treitschke that night seemed to hear in his words, as they heard in his lectures again and again, the first dark roll that announces the coming dreadful storm, the coming war—the war that he regarded as simply inevitable—between these two empires, both the descendants of the war-god Odin, and yet, *because* of that, doomed to this great conflict."²

With such a spirit of jingoism prevalent, both in public and private utterance, a provocative policy was to be expected. Balked in her South African designs, Constantinople became the storm centre of German intrigue; it was a question of Pan-Germanism versus Pan-Slavism. Russia was enfeebled by her war with Japan; the Pan-Germans pressed towards the goal of Salonika in Europe, and in Asia Minor strove for spheres of influence and the building of the Bagdad Railway to the Persian Gulf. The success of the Bagdad Railway scheme was bound up in the success of Austrian designs in the Balkans. To gain this end it was necessary to acquire the predominant influence in Turkey. This was not so difficult of accomplishment, because Abdul Hamid had never forgiven Great Britain for her share in Egyptian interference, and there was a traditional German, or rather Prussian, friendship with Turkey which dated from the reign of Frederick

¹ Ernest Barker, *Nietzsche and Treitschke*. Oxford Pamphlets.

² J. A. Cramb's *Germany and England*, p. 69.

the Great. As an offshoot to the rapidly increasing cult of Pan-Slavism the Kaiser proposed a revival of Pan-Islamism to the Sultan, and Abdul, anxious to sow seeds of discord in Egypt and India, gladly acquiesced in the proposal. About this time the German Emperor bombastically took the Mohammedans under his protection, and German money was spent in fostering Islam discontent. Every effort was made to gain a firm footing in Asia Minor; and the authorization for the Bagdad Railway was granted by the Porte in 1902.

Some attempts were made to interest the British Government in the scheme, but the military nature of the railway, and the growing understanding with Russia, prompted a wise refusal. "The new lines would double the military strength of the Ottoman Empire. Further, the prosperity of Mesopotamia and Asia Minor would revive, stimulated as it would be by the immigration of numbers of Germans. Thus, both in a financial and military sense, Turkey would soon be able to resist her redoubtable enemy, Russia."¹ In fact, the real object of this big railway scheme was not lost upon either Great Britain or Russia; they perceived the German designs upon Persia, and in 1907 an agreement was arrived at between the two countries, whereby their respective interests in Persia were delimited. There was an uncomfortable moment in 1910, when the Emperor Nicholas and the Emperor William met at Potsdam, and an agreement for pooling German and Russian interests in Asia Minor seemed likely. In view of the severe rebuff inflicted on Russian diplomacy in 1908, when, it will be remembered, the Kaiser appeared "in shining armour" by the side of his Austrian ally, this meeting has its extraordinary aspect. But the strange *volte-face* may possibly be accounted for in a temporary ascendancy, due to a despondency over the events of 1908, of the Germanophil section of the court party, which had been in the cold shade of opposition since the failure of the Asiatic venture. It was a last despairing effort to detach Russia from France, and, in the light of recent events, it accounts for the eagerness of the German general staff to plunge into hostilities in 1911. In that year it is significant that Sir Edward Grey "demanded that, if a railway were made to the Gulf, it must be a purely commercial undertaking".²

To resume, if Turkey were to be the ally of the Pan-German conspiracy it was highly essential that she should be strong. Consequently German officers and civil administrators were dispatched from the Fatherland, and a merry work of regeneration—or shall we say Prussianizing—of Ottoman institutions took place. Abdul Hamid was only too willing to reorganize his army at German expense. Then came the disconcerting Young Turks' rebellion, which looked like upsetting the German plans, and the answer was the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in defiance of the sanctity of treaties. There was great indignation amongst the Powers of the Triple Entente, but, as we have seen, the German Emperor came to the rescue of his ally and Russian policy in the Balkans became impotent. High hopes were placed

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Origins of the War*.

² *Ibid.*

in the Young Turks' party, but their mismanagement was so confessed that by 1909, chiefly thanks to the careful diplomacy of Baron Marschall von Bieberstein, German influence was once more in the ascendancy at Constantinople, and the German military preparations in Turkey seemed prosperous, when they received an inconvenient check by the unexpected claim of Italy for her long-promised reward—Tripoli. Italy refused to wait any longer. Germany was forced to acquiesce in a position inimical to her interests or throw Italy out of the Triple Alliance into the open arms of the Triple Entente. Moreover, the treaty of the Triple Alliance was due for renewal in 1913. French and British diplomacy was at work to detach Italy from Germany and Austria; and French and British support looked like forthcoming for her when, "To everyone's astonishment, it became clear that England and France were in no position to assist Tripoli openly. The hostility in the native races in Tripoli to the proposed arrangement [i.e. peaceful penetration with subsequent annexation] was only too promptly shown; the flames of Moslem indignation ran high throughout North Africa, and for some weeks it seemed not improbable that a holy war against the infidel might break out. Keen observers believed that a more open support of Italy by England or France would be the signal for the Jihad. Even to gain vastly more than either nation could possibly lose by the delay of Italy's complete possession of Tripoli, such a contingency was not to be risked."¹ Thus, with no definite support from the Triple Entente, and with the Machiavellian hints from Potsdam of the weakness of the British naval power in the Mediterranean, Italy persuaded herself that her interests lay in renewing the partnership with Germany and Austria, whose game in the Balkans, she must have known, she had thoroughly spoilt.

The success of the Tripolitan venture revealed the weakness of Turkey. It was no longer a question of waiting for the regeneration of Turkey on German military lines, it was a question for the Pan-Germanists to utilize the existing position for their own ends, or, in other words, of playing their cards in a different way. The result was war in the Balkans; by that means Tripoli would be detached for Italy without further bloodshed, and German interests could be concentrated in Turkey; moreover the Wilhelmstrasse held the Balkan League cheaply. But, oddly enough, the same idea of a solution by war occurred to the Triple Entente: "The Balkan States, who received intimations of the desirability of war from Berlin and Vienna, were astounded to receive, almost simultaneously, suggestions of the desirability of war with Turkey from London, Paris, and St. Petersburg. The Triple Entente had made up its mind that the moment was opportune for an attempt to erect a barrier in the way of Pan-Germanism which should not improbably postpone its execution at least a decade."²

The result of the campaign was a surprise to the Powers, and to none more than Austria, who was galled to see little Serbia rising into prominence in Slavdom. The course of the war we have followed, and

¹ Roland G. Usher's *Pan-Germanism*, p. 181.

² *Ibid.*, p. 209

we have seen how it resulted in the quarrelling of the Allies, owing to the unconciliatory attitude of Bulgaria. Cajoled by the flattery of Potsdam and the hope of assistance from Vienna, Bulgaria wantonly attacked Serbia and Greece, and, to the further upsetting of the Pan-German calculations, suffered defeat, while the hitherto neutral Rumania intervened. Serbia had to be kept from the Adriatic, and Austria and Italy made a pretence of being pleased at the creation of the neutral state of Albania. The unsatisfactory peace of Bucharest was signed, and it became obvious that the Pan-Germans were merely marking time in the Balkans.

The other great Pan-German venture in Morocco has been dealt with at the end of Volume IV, as well as in the text of the present volume. The first Moroccan crisis of 1905-6 culminated in the Congress of Algeciras and the Agadir incident of 1911, and it would be merely tedious to labour the point further. The year 1911 provided the crucial test, and revealed the warlike tendencies of Germany. War would certainly have broken out in that year but for three facts: firstly, the Italian position was not clear; secondly, the Kaiser wished to wait for the completion of the deepening of the Kiel Canal; and thirdly, and the most important reason of all, the German financiers were unprepared. It was discovered that German finance at that moment was controlled in London, Paris, and New York. "The Day" certainly looked promising, but the cost thereof had to be considered.

German diplomacy climbed down, and the Balkan imbroglio was connived at, with its unexpected result. It was thought in Berlin and Vienna that the Turks would make a better show, that the Balkan League would split up on the rock of its age-long jealousies, or at the very worst that the position would end in a stalemate from which the Pan-Germans must profit. It never entered into the heads of Teutonic diplomats that a group of powerful independent States, highly zealous for their own autonomy, would spring from the ruins of Turkey, and that the end of the pretty Balkan plot would be a diplomatic situation in which the Powers of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente cynically expressed their desire to localize the conflict. The Triple Alliance was patched up by the creation of that independent kingdom which nobody wanted—Albania; and it is amusing in the light of recent events to reflect that Prince William of Wied was strongly advised by his emperor not to accept the Albanian crown.

Thus four grand German schemes of expansion have been thwarted—in South Africa, in Morocco, in the Balkans, and in Asia Minor by the minimizing of the military significance of the Bagdad Railway and its appropriation to the commercial development of that region. It was the misfortune of Prussian diplomacy in pushing forward imperial designs to have to do so at someone else's expense; moreover it was her further misfortune to be burthened with a legacy of hate, the just result of her military and arbitrary methods; nowhere could she look for some gratitude for past favours conferred. Great Britain, in the interests of peace, had permitted the German system of colonization by



WILLIAM II, GERMAN EMPEROR

A photographic study of the "War Lord" in winter campaigning uniform, 1914

From a photograph by Underwood & Underwood

NAWAB SALAR JUNG BAHADUR.

"compensation" for movements elsewhere, but the deliberate fostering of Boer sedition proved even too much for her patience, and the period of naval rivalry began; Austria, driven out of Germany by the Prussian victory of Sadowa, had no love for the northern kingdom, but in her designs on the Near East, and further in the impression of the Magyar caste upon Hungary, saw the necessity of the German Alliance; Russia, disgusted with the "honest broker's" efforts at the Congress of Berlin, and the sly Potsdam incentives to the Manchurian venture, recognized her enemy in time and gradually emancipated herself from the German ascendancy; and France never permitted herself to forget the lost provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. The arrival of the big Central Empire under the military ægis of Prussia has upset the easy-going old ways of European diplomacy, that period in which the movements of the Powers could generally be easily gauged in Paris, Vienna, Petrograd, or London. In place of the comfortable old ways sprang up the new and tortuous methods of the Wilhelmstrasse, with its elaborate secret service, whereby the Frankenstein of the "armed peace" has been created under whose weight Prussia must eventually be crushed.

After 1911 it became evident that Germany did intend, under the pretext of Pan-Germanism, which after all has only been very nebulously defined, to attack the liberties of Europe when the occasion seemed favourable. In 1912 the Turkish plans of Austria and Germany went apley, and in 1913 these were made good by the addition of several corps to the German army, to which France replied by reverting to the three years system, and Russia by an increase in her forces. "Germany seems therefore to have resolved to strike her blow before the Russian increase could take effect. It is significant that the German war tax on fortunes, which was intended ostensibly to cover the cost of the increase in the German army, was timed to be collected in July of the present year [1914]. This date indicates the approximate moment when Germany was determined to force matters to an issue."¹

It is further significant that during the year 1913 the chancelleries of Europe had warning of the German Emperor's definite abandonment of the role of peacemaker and his adhesion to the military party. M. Jules Cambon, in dispatch No. 6 of the French Yellow Book, writes of a conversation between the German Emperor and the King of the Belgians in the presence of General von Moltke: "Hostility against us is becoming more marked, and the Emperor has ceased to be a partisan of peace, . . . William II has been brought to think that war with France is inevitable, and that it will have to come to it one day or the other. . . . General von Moltke spoke in exactly the same sense as his Sovereign. He also declared that war was necessary and inevitable, but he showed himself still more certain of success. . . . The King of the Belgians protested that to interpret the intentions of the French Government in this manner was to travesty them, and to allow oneself to be misled as to the feelings of the French nation by the manifestations of a few hotheads or conscienceless intriguers. The Emperor and

¹ *Times* Introduction to the French Yellow Book.

his Chief of General Staff none the less persisted in this point of view."

These are but instances out of many that could be cited to show the trend of German public opinion. Germany would strike when the hour was favourable, and from the Empire's point of view never did such a favourable point of view dawn for military aggression as the year 1914. Her adversaries seemed hampered by domestic difficulties. Great Britain stood perilously near to civil war, with a Government impotent even to deal with the question of Women's Suffrage, and forced to dance to the tune of the Irish and the Labour members; Russia was in the throes of labour unrest and railway difficulties, moreover the increase in her army could not be immediately effective; the same state of affairs existed in France, who was beset by the syndicalists, and her three years system would not be a military gain for several years. It might be added that the British naval strength was at its lowest, from the point of view of the two-power standard—and the deepening of the Kiel Canal was completed.

Further, the German cause was strengthened by the renewal of the alliance with Italy and her favourable position in Turkey. The mine was laid, and it only required a pretext for firing it. On 28 June, 1914, the heir-apparent to the Dual Monarchy, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife, the Duchess of Hohenberg, were murdered at Serajevo by two Bosnian Serbs, and the pretext was found by fastening complicity in the plot upon Belgrade. The reader by now will be familiar with the nature of the representations to Serbia and the heavy diplomatic methods of Vienna. Austria was clamouring for war, and the Pan-Germans seized their opportunity. "The opportunity was all the more favourable because Austria generally viewed with suspicion and alarm the forward moves of Germany. As von Bernhardi says in his preface to his book, *How Germany Makes War*, neither Austria nor Italy took any interest in Germany's world policy. They were therefore certain to desert her if she began hostilities on her own account. But in July, 1914, Austria, the backward partner, was eager for war. What a chance! It might never again recur."¹

We have no need to dwell upon the actual events of the rupture with Russia and France, as they are set forth in the Epilogue to Vol. IV. On 3 August, 1914, the neutrality of Belgium was violated by the German army, and an ultimatum was dispatched to Berlin by the British Government, which falling on unheeding ears was followed by a declaration of war. The heroic deeds of the Belgian army in the defence of Liège, whereby the Teuton hordes were checked; the marvellous retreat from Mons and the victory of the Marne, whereby the liberties of Europe were saved, are to supply a noble theme for another pen. If proof were necessary of the designs of German aggression and preparedness for war, those early days in Belgium and the torrential outpouring of troops almost to the very gates of Paris provide an irrefutable answer.

¹ J. Holland Rose's *The Origins of the War*, p. 137.

**THE
STORY OF THE GREAT WAR**

THE STORY OF THE GREAT WAR

CHAPTER I

THE MILITARY POSITION AT THE OUTBREAK OF WAR

THE GERMAN ARMY.—The army is the most distinctively national institution of the German Empire, as one might naturally expect in a state whose unity was built up so largely through successful wars. For many years it has been generally regarded as the most perfect military machine in the world, although in some points of equipment, and in some of its methods, it is probably surpassed by the armies of other first-class Powers. The whole military force of the Empire forms a single army in time of war under the supreme command of the German Emperor, but in time of peace the Bavarian army is under the administration of the King of Bavaria, and does not take the military oath to the Emperor. In Saxony and Württemberg, as well as in Bavaria, there is a separate War Office, but all the other states have their military affairs managed by Prussia as though they were integral parts of the Prussian kingdom.

Under the constitution of the Empire every male German is liable to military service, but only a portion of those attaining military age each year are actually trained. Liability for service begins at the age of seventeen, but recruits are not taken for service in the regular army till the age of twenty. Since 1893 the term of active service in the regular army has been two years for all arms except cavalry and horse artillery, in which the term is three years. After serving his two (or three) years in the Active Army the soldier is regarded as belonging to the Regular Reserve for five (or four) years, during which he has to put in two trainings of not more than eight weeks each. He then passes to the First Ban of the Landwehr, which is as nearly akin to the British Territorial force as the German compulsory system admits of. The term of service in the First Ban of the Landwehr is five years (three years for cavalry and horse artillery), during which there are two trainings of a week or a fortnight. The citizen then passes for seven

years (nine for cavalry and horse artillery) into the Second Ban of the Landwehr, during which he receives no further training. Having completed his thirty-ninth year, he is reckoned as belonging to the Second Ban of the Landsturm, a purely home-defence force, until his military obligation ends at the age of forty-five. Besides the Regular Reserve of the Active Army above referred to there is an Ersatz Reserve (i.e. compensatory or substitutionary reserve) consisting of fit young men who have not been called up for regular training, those allowed to postpone their military service, and those only moderately fit for service. This reserve undergoes a certain amount of training, and is intended to maintain the fighting units at full strength in the event of mobilization for war. Those who have been twelve years in the Ersatz Reserve pass into the Second Ban of the Landwehr until the completion of their thirty-ninth year, and thereafter they belong to the Second Ban of the Landsturm until the age of forty-five. The First Ban of the Landsturm comprises, up to the age of thirty-nine, all who have never undergone any military service or training; from thirty-nine to forty-five they are added to the Second Ban. It is important to bear in mind the difference between the two Bans of the Landsturm. Young men who have attained a certain moderately high educational standard are at liberty to serve for one year only, but they must provide their own equipment and maintenance.

The German army at the outbreak of war was organized in 25 Army Corps on a territorial basis, except for the Prussian Guard Corps, which was recruited from all parts of the Empire. These corps were grouped for administrative purposes into eight Inspections, each under an Inspector-General. The Corps and the Inspections, with their headquarters, were as follows:—

First Inspection (Danzig): Corps I (Königsberg), XVII (Danzig), and XX (Allenstein).

Second Inspection (Berlin): Prussian Guard Corps (Berlin), XII (1st Saxon; Dresden), and XIX (2nd Saxon; Leipzig).

Third Inspection (Hanover): Corps VII (Münster), IX (Altona), and X (Hanover).

Fourth Inspection (Munich): Corps III (Berlin) and the Bavarian Corps I (Munich), II (Würzburg), and III (Nürnberg).

Fifth Inspection (Carlsruhe): Corps VIII (Coblenz), XIV (Carlsruhe), and XV (Strassburg).

Sixth Inspection (Stuttgart): Corps IV (Magdeburg), XI (Cassel), and XIII (Stuttgart).

Seventh Inspection (Saarbrücken): Corps XVI (Metz), XVIII (Frankfort-on-the-Main), and XXI (Saarbrücken).

Eighth Inspection (Berlin): Corps II (Stettin), V (Posen), and VI (Breslau).

There was also a General Inspection of Cavalry at Berlin, with Inspections of Cavalry under it at Posen, Stettin, Strassburg, and Saarbrücken; there were Inspections of Garrison Artillery in Berlin, Strassburg, and Cologne, under a General Inspection at Berlin; there were

Inspections of Engineers at Berlin, Posen, Strassburg, and Metz, and Inspections of Pioneers at Berlin, Mainz, Strassburg, and Thorn, all under a chief at Berlin; and so on.

Each of the 25 Army Corps consisted of 2 Divisions, and each Division consisted of 2 Infantry Brigades, except that in the Prussian Guard Corps and the five frontier Corps, V, VI, VII, IX, XIV, one of the Divisions comprised 3 Brigades. Each Infantry Brigade comprised 2 Regiments of 3 Battalions each, but a few of the Brigades were made up of 3 Regiments, equal to 9 Battalions. Most of the Corps had 1 Jäger or Light Infantry Battalion attached to them, in a few cases 2. Accordingly, the peace establishment of the German army consisted, so far as infantry was concerned, of 50 Divisions = 106 Brigades = 217 Regiments = 669 Battalions (including Jäger), and the total strength in 1913, including officers, was 489,374.

In time of peace there were no Cavalry Divisions except one attached to the Prussian Guard Corps, but each Division of an Army Corps included a Cavalry Brigade of 2 Regiments, mostly of 5 Squadrons each. Of the 5 Squadrons of a Cavalry Regiment one would serve in war as a depot for the others. The frontier Corps, I, VI, and XVI, had each an extra Cavalry Brigade. The total cavalry establishment in peace was accordingly 55 Brigades = 110 Regiments = 547 Squadrons, with a total strength, including officers, of 85,703. The 110 cavalry regiments comprised 14 of Cuirassiers, 28 of Dragoons, 23 of Hussars, 25 of Uhlans (or Lancers), and 20 of Mounted Jäger.

Each Division of an Army Corps included a Field Artillery Brigade of 2 Regiments, each of 2 Groups, each Group consisting of 3 Batteries. Ten of the Corps had Batteries of Horse Artillery in addition. The peace artillery establishment as a whole consisted of 50 Brigades = 100 Regiments = 600 Batteries of Field Artillery and 33 Batteries of Horse Artillery. A Battery of Field Artillery comprised 6 guns, one of Horse Artillery 4 guns. The strength in men was, including officers, 91,469.

Each Army Corps included also a Battalion of Train, corresponding to the British Army Service Corps, and at least one Battalion of Pioneers, equivalent to our Engineers. Adding together troops of every kind, the total peace strength of the German army in 1913 was 791,002, including 30,029 officers. The German army, like the British, was dressed in a field uniform that embodied the principle of protective coloration. Their *Feldgrau* (field grey) was indeed an improvement on khaki.

The Army law of 1913, which was a reply to Russia's increase of her peace effective, introduced important changes intended to increase the peace effective and to reduce the amount of dependence on untrained or imperfectly trained men in case of mobilization. In that year the war strength of trained men, including the Active Army, Regular Reserve, Ersatz Reserve (so far as trained), Landwehr, and Landsturm (so far as trained), was estimated at more than 4,000,000 men, and the law of 1913 would in time have raised this to over

The Story of the Great War

5,000,000. The exact method of utilizing the reserve forces in war was a secret of the Great General Staff, but Army Corps would probably have reserve divisions added to them, and new Corps would doubtless be formed out of trained reserves. Army Corps would be grouped into Armies in time of war, an arrangement already foreshadowed in the inspections above enumerated, but the groupings there given might not be adhered to in every case. The first-line army at the outbreak of war would be not less than 1,500,000.

In war the Cavalry Brigade was withdrawn from one Division of each Army Corps, and also the Horse Artillery (if any), and these were used to make up Cavalry Divisions, each of 3 Cavalry Brigades, with 3 Horse Batteries and other auxiliary troops. The other Cavalry Brigade of a Corps was divided between the two Divisions, one Regiment to each. Thus the Army Corps in war consisted of 2 Infantry Divisions (= 4 Brigades = about 25 Battalions), 2 Cavalry Regiments (= 8 Squadrons), 2 Field Artillery Brigades (= 4 Regiments = 8 Groups = 24 Batteries = 144 guns), together with a Heavy Howitzer Battalion and other Corps troops, besides Divisional Trains, &c. The strength of such an Army Corps was about 41,000, and that of a Cavalry Division about 5000.

THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN ARMY.—The army of the Dual Monarchy includes three portions, namely (1) the Common Army, administered by the common government of the whole combined state; (2) the Austrian Landwehr and Landsturm, administered by the Austrian Empire; (3) the Hungarian Landwehr (Honvéd) and Landsturm (Népfőkelés), administered by the Hungarian kingdom. Military service is obligatory on all males throughout the monarchy, but only a portion of those liable undergo much training. Actual service begins at the age of twenty-one, and the normal period is two years with the colours and ten in the Regular Reserve. In the cavalry and horse artillery, however, and to a certain extent in other arms, the period in the Active Army is three years and the reserve period seven years. Regular reservists undergo during their ten years four trainings, not exceeding fourteen weeks in all; short-term reservists have only three trainings, not exceeding eleven weeks in all. There is also an Ersatz Reserve similar to that of the German Empire, with a service period of twelve years; and one-year volunteers are accepted on an educational qualification, as in Germany. The periods of active and reserve service in the Austrian Landwehr and the Hungarian Honvéd are the same as in the Common Army, and indeed these forces are closely akin to the Common Army, being composed of men not required by the latter out of the annual contingent who reach the age of twenty-one. The Austro-Hungarian Landwehrs are therefore very different in character from the German forces of the same name. Landwehr men undergo periodic short trainings. Those not absorbed by the Common Army or the Landwehrs may be taken into the Ersatz Reserve. The Landsturms are for all who have not been included in any other force, and also for those who have completed their active and reserve service in the other

forces. Military obligation ends at the age of forty-two. A special military tax is imposed upon all who are not capable of serving. In Bosnia and Herzegovina there is no Landwehr or Landsturm, but there are a First, Second, and Third Reserve.

The Common Army was divided, in time of peace, into 16 Army Corps on a territorial basis, the numbers and headquarters being as follows:—

I—Cracow (Galicia); II—Vienna (Austria); III—Graz (Styria); IV—Budapest (Hungary); V—Pressburg (Hungary); VI—Kassa (Hungary); VII—Temesvár (Hungary); VIII—Prague (Bohemia); IX—Leitmeritz (Bohemia); X—Przemysl (Galicia); XI—Lemberg (Galicia); XII—Hermannstadt (Transylvania); XIII—Agram (Croatia-Slavonia); XIV—Innsbruck (Tyrol); XV—Serajevo (Bosnia); XVI—Ragusa (Dalmatia).

These Corps each consisted of two Divisions of Infantry, with the exception of II, which included three Divisions, and each Corps also included a Brigade of Cavalry, a Brigade of Field Artillery, and a Section of Train. There were also 8 Cavalry Divisions, located at Temesvár, Vienna, Lemberg, Jaroslau, Pressburg, Cracow, Stanislaw, and Budapest, 4 of them in the frontier province of Galicia. An Infantry Division comprised 2 Brigades, each of 2 Regiments, and each Regiment consisted of 3 or 4 Battalions. A Cavalry Division consisted of 2 Brigades, each of 2 Regiments, each Regiment consisting of 6 Squadrons. A Brigade of Field Artillery consisted of 2 Regiments, each of 4 or 6 Batteries, each Battery having 6 guns.

The total peace effective of the Common Army was as follows in 1913: Infantry, including Tyrolese Rifles and other Light Infantry, 196,957 officers and men; Cavalry, 47,151 officers and men; Field Artillery, including Horse and Mountain Artillery, 37,069 officers and men; total, including other troops, 311,952. In addition, the Austrian Landwehr numbered 48,579, and the Hungarian Honvéd 36,247; giving altogether an effective peace total of 396,778, or, adding staff and establishments, 424,258. This total included 34,009 officers. The first-line forces on a war basis would probably exceed 1,000,000, and the total military force, including Landsturm, would exceed 4,000,000.

The Austro-Hungarian monarchy is a very composite state, comprising numerous different races speaking different languages and often cherishing mutual jealousies. The Germans number about 12 million, the Magyars about 10 million, the Bohemians, Moravians, and Slovaks about 8½ million, the Serbs and Croats about 5½ million, the Poles about 5 million, the Ruthenians about 4 million, the Roumanians about 3 million, the Slovenes about 1½ million, and the Italians about ¾ million. Austria cannot use her Polish troops in Galicia against Russia without some risk, and similarly her Italian troops are not employed in the Trentino or her Serb troops in Bosnia. Such considerations complicate her military problem.

THE FRENCH ARMY.—The principle of obligatory military service for all male citizens was first effectively applied in France by the law

The Story of the Great War

of 1889, under which the term of service was fixed at three years. The increasing preponderance of the German peace effective over the French, due to the stagnant state of population in France, perplexed French statesmen and military authorities for many years, and led to the enactment of the Two Years' Service Law, which came into force in 1906. This law reduced the term of service with the colours to two years, but enforced compulsion with a stringency quite unknown in the much more populous German Empire. The influence of Russia, the ally of France, strengthened by further German efforts, led to the passing of a French law in 1913 enacting a return to three years' service, while maintaining the obligation of universal service at its maximum. Beyond this law it is impossible for France to go.

Every male citizen of France who is physically fit serves in the Active Army from the age of twenty to the age of twenty-three. He then passes into the Active Reserve for eleven years, during which he receives two trainings, one of twenty-three days and one of seventeen. For seven years more he belongs to the Territorial Army, in which he receives one training of nine days; thereafter he is classed in the Territorial Reserve till the completion of his forty-eighth year, without liability for further training.

In time of peace the French army was organized in 21 Army Corps, the numbers and headquarters being as follows:—

I—Lille; II—Amiens; III—Rouen; IV—Le Mans; V—Orléans; VI—Châlons-sur-Marne; VII—Besançon; VIII—Bourges; IX—Tours; X—Rennes; XI—Nantes; XII—Limoges; XIII—Clermont-Ferrand; XIV—Lyons; XV—Marseilles; XVI—Montpellier; XVII—Toulouse; XVIII—Bordeaux; XIX—Algiers; XX—Nancy; XXI—Épinal.

The troops of Algeria and Tunis were regarded as forming part of the Home or Metropolitan Army, and not of the Colonial Army. They constituted the XIXth Army Corps, as shown in the preceding list. The XXth and XXIst Corps were formed in recent years on the German frontier, the latter within a year of the Great War, to meet the recent military expansion of the German Empire. Paris constituted a special military command under a Military Governor.

Each Army Corps comprised 2 Divisions, with the exception of the eastern frontier Corps, VI and VII, and the Algerian Corps (XIX), which had 3 Divisions. A Division consisted of 2 Brigades, each of 2 Regiments, and a Regiment usually included 3 Battalions. Accordingly, the total number of Divisions was 45, comprising 89 Brigades, or about 600 Battalions. An Army Corps also included a Regiment of Cavalry, consisting of 5 Squadrons in time of peace, of which one would serve as a depot in war; a Regiment of Field Artillery (in addition to the Divisional Artillery) of 12 Batteries, besides reinforcing Batteries; a Battalion of Engineers, a Squadron of Train, &c. The Artillery of a Division consisted of a Regiment of 9 Batteries. In France a Battery included 4 guns.

Besides the Cavalry attached to the Army Corps there were 10 permanent Cavalry Divisions, mostly near the eastern frontiers, with headquarters as follows:—

I—Paris; II—Lunéville; III—Compiègne; IV—Sedan; V—Reims; VI—Lyons; VII—Melun; VIII—Dôle; IX—Tours; X—Limoges.

A Cavalry Division consisted of 3 Brigades, each of 2 Regiments, with a group of Horse Artillery, consisting of 2 Batteries. Of the 30 Brigades 6 were Cuirassiers, 15 Dragoons, and 9 Light Cavalry.

The mobilized strength of an Army Corps was about 33,000 combatants, and of a Cavalry Division about 4700 combatants. The peace effective of the Infantry in 1913 was 361,348. This included the Light Infantry known as Chasseurs à pied, many of whom were specially suited for fighting among the mountains of the east and south-east; the white Algerian Zouaves; and the black Algerian Turcos. The peace effective of the Cavalry was 73,369, including the white Algerian Chasseurs d'Afrique and the black Algerian Spahis. The peace effective of the Artillery was 97,571, and of the whole army 617,700, of whom about 30,000 were officers.

On mobilization the Active Reserve not only brings the Active Army up to war strength, but also forms 36 Reserve Divisions distributed throughout the Army Corps districts. The Territorial Army is also formed on mobilization into regional reserve divisions. The first-line army at the outbreak of war was rather under 1,500,000, and the total number of more or less trained men was about 4,000,000.

THE RUSSIAN ARMY.—Compulsory military service was introduced in Russia by a law of 1874, and its conditions have been modified by subsequent laws down to 1912. Service in the Active Army begins at the age of twenty-one and continues for three years, but in the cavalry, horse artillery, engineers, and some other branches the period is four years. Then follows a term of fifteen (or fourteen) years in the Reserve of the Active Army, with liability for two periods of training of six weeks each. On the completion of his term of service in the Reserve the citizen passes into the First Ban of the Opolchenie or Territorial Army, where he remains till the age of forty-three. The First Ban of the Opolchenie includes also those young men who, though fit, have not been taken up into the Active Army. It is therefore equivalent to a combination of the German Landwehr with the Ersatz Reserve. The Second Ban of the Opolchenie includes all exempted from actual service for any reason. The Cossacks of the south are liable to military service on a different footing. They hold their lands on military tenure, and their liability for service extends to the whole term of their lives. After a year's training at the age of twenty in their native village, they undergo four years of active service in the first category; then for four years more they belong to the second category, with an annual training of three weeks, after which they are passed into the third category for four years, with a single training of three weeks, followed by five years

in the fourth category. Thereafter they may still be called out, under special circumstances, for national defence. The Cossack troops are nearly all cavalry. Mohammedans in the Caucasus region are exempted from service on payment of a special military tax. Russia also enrolls one-year volunteers on similar lines to those of Germany.

The Russian Army was organized in 27 Territorial Army Corps, besides 3 Army Corps in the Caucasus, 2 Army Corps in Turkestan, and 5 Army Corps in Siberia, 37 Army Corps in all. These Corps were grouped in 12 Military Circumscriptions, or Districts, somewhat akin to the German Inspections. The Districts and Corps, with their headquarters, were as follows:—

Amur District: 1st Siberian Corps (Nikolsk, on the Amur), 4th Siberian Corps (Vladivostok), 5th Siberian Corps (Khabarovsk).

Caucasus District: 1st Caucasus Corps (Tiflis), 2nd Caucasus Corps (Tiflis), 3rd Caucasus Corps (Vladikavkaz).

Irkutsk District: 2nd Siberian Corps (Chita), 3rd Siberian Corps (Irkutsk).

Kasan District: Corps XVI (Kazan) and XXIV (Samara).

Kiev District: Corps IX (Kiev), X (Kharkov), XI (Rovno), XII (Vinniza), and XXI (Kiev).

Moscow District: Grenadier Corps (Moscow), Corps V (Voronezh), XIII (Smolensk), XVII (Moscow), and XXV (Moscow).

Odessa District: Corps VII (Simferopol) and VIII (Odessa).

Omsk District: including Tomsk and Tobolsk.

Petrograd District: Guard Corps (Petrograd), Corps I (Petrograd), XVIII (Petrograd), and XXII (Helsingfors).

Turkestan District: 1st Turkestan Corps (Tashkent), 2nd Turkestan Corps (Askabad).

Warsaw District: Corps VI (Bielostok), XIV (Lublin), XV (Warsaw), XIX (Warsaw), XXIII (Warsaw).

Vilna District: Corps II (Grodno), III (Vilna), IV (Minsk), and XX (Riga).

An Army Corps usually consisted of 2 Divisions of Infantry, but there were some exceptions. The Guard Corps comprised 3 Divisions of Infantry, of which one was attached to Corps XXIII, and the Grenadier Corps also comprised 3 Infantry Divisions, one being attached to Corps XXV. Corps XVI and XVIII comprised 3 Infantry Divisions; Corps XIV had only 1 Infantry Division, but in addition it included 2 Brigades of Rifles; Corps XXII consisted entirely of 3 Brigades of Finland Rifles. The Guard Corps included a Brigade of Rifles of the Guard, and a Brigade of Rifles was attached to each of Corps III, VIII, and XII.

A Cavalry Division formed part of each of the Corps II, III, VI, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XVI, and XIX, and also of the Grenadier Corps; Corps XII and XIX had a Cossack Division in addition; Corps XIV and XV and the Guard Corps had 2 Cavalry Divisions; and Corps V, VIII, XX, and XXIII included a Brigade of Cavalry. The three Caucasus Corps each included, besides regular Infantry Divisions, a Division of Caucasus Cossacks, the first two had in addition a Brigade of Caucasus Rifles, and the second Corps included the Caucasus Cavalry

Division. The Turkestan Corps were composed of Turkestan Rifles and Cossacks, the Siberian Corps of Siberian Rifles, with Cossacks and other cavalry.

An Infantry Division consisted of 2 Brigades, each of 2 Regiments, each Regiment including 4 Battalions. A Cavalry Division comprised 2 Brigades = 4 Regiments = 24 Squadrons. The Field Artillery Brigade attached to an Army Corps consisted of 6 Batteries, each of 8 guns, but the war strength in guns, including heavy artillery, of an Army Corps was 120.

The total peace strength of the Russian army was 1284 Battalions of Infantry, 511 Squadrons of Cavalry, and about 650 Batteries of Artillery. The peace effective in men was about 1,380,000. The war strength of an Infantry Division was about 18,000 men, of a Cavalry Division about 4000 men, of an Army Corps over 40,000 men. On a war footing the Active Army, if equipment were available, might number about 3,000,000 men.

THE BRITISH ARMY.—The British Army differs from the armies of all the other Powers of Europe in being a highly professional army based entirely upon voluntary enlistment. It includes the Regular Army, which is stationed partly at home and partly abroad—especially in India—the Army Reserve, the Special Reserve, which replaces the old Militia, the Territorial Force, which replaces the old Volunteers and Yeomanry, and the National Reserve, equivalent to the former Veteran Reserve. Enlistment in the Regular Army is for seven years, followed by five in the Army Reserve, which is called up in time of war to bring the Regular Army up to full war strength. The Special Reserve battalions mostly serve as depots for maintaining the strength of the regular battalions of the regiments with which they are associated, but some of them, called Extra Reserve battalions, are intended as a reserve available on mobilization. The Territorial Force is for home defence only in time of peace, but even before the war many of its officers and men, including some complete units, had volunteered for foreign service in the event of war. Enlistment in the Territorial Force was for four years, the obligation undertaken involving a certain number of drills per annum, a musketry course, and a week or fortnight in camp each year. There are no Territorials in Ireland. The Special Reserve and the Territorial Force are organized in close association with the Regular Army and on the same plan. Each infantry Regiment, for instance, consists of two (occasionally four) battalions of Regulars, one or more battalions of Special Reserve, and one or more battalions of Territorials. Of the two regular battalions of a Regiment, one in time of peace was stationed abroad, mostly in India, and the other at home, the foreign one being at full war strength, and the other on a reduced effective. In the numbering of the battalions of a regiment the Regular battalions come first, then the Reserve battalions, and after these the Territorial battalions. The new battalions raised for the Great War were attached to the existing Regiments, and numbered as Service battalions after the Territorials. For instance, the

The Story of the Great War

Cameronians (Scottish Rifles) comprised a 1st and 2nd battalion of Regulars, a 3rd and 4th battalion of Reserve, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th battalions of Territorials, and Service battalions numbered from 9 upwards.

The British Army in time of peace included 31 Cavalry Regiments, with 3 Reserve Regiments; 55 Regiments of Yeomanry or Territorial Cavalry; the Royal Regiment of Artillery, including Royal Horse Artillery, Royal Field Artillery, and the Royal Garrison Artillery, with Special Reserves and Territorials; the Corps of Royal Engineers, including Special Reserve and Territorial Companies; 4 Regiments of Foot Guards (9 Regular and 4 Reserve battalions); 69 Regiments of Infantry of the Line, comprising 148 Regular battalions, 101 Reserve battalions, and 174 Territorial battalions, besides 33 other Territorial battalions; Army Service Corps, Royal Army Medical Corps, &c. The Cavalry comprised the Household Cavalry (1st and 2nd Life Guards and Royal Horse Guards), which were never stationed abroad in peace time, 7 Regiments of Dragoon Guards, 3 Regiments of Dragoons, 12 Regiments of Hussars, and 6 Regiments of Lancers. The Foot Guards comprised the Grenadier Guards, Coldstream Guards, Scots Guards, and Irish Guards, and since the outbreak of the war a Regiment of Welsh Guards has been formed. The establishment of the British Army on the eve of war, and its effective strength, were as follows:—

Regular Army, 168,500 estab., 156,110 eff.; Army Reserve, 147,000 estab., 146,756 eff.; Special Reserve, 80,120 estab., 63,089 eff.; Territorial Force, 315,485 estab., 251,706 eff.; Regular Army on Indian Establishment, 75,896 estab., 78,476 eff.; total establishment, including some smaller forces, 803,128, total effective, 711,575. The total strength of the Regular Infantry on the eve of war was 149,441, of the Regular Cavalry, 20,325, of the Regular Artillery, 48,293.

In Britain the Army Corps is not recognized in time of peace, but for purposes of administration there are 8 Commands, as follows:—

Aldershot Command; Eastern Command, with London as Headquarters, including 2 Districts; Irish Command, with Dublin as Headquarters, including 2 Districts; London District Command; Northern Command, with York as Headquarters, including 2 Districts; Scottish Command, with Edinburgh as Headquarters, including 2 Districts; Southern Command, with Salisbury as Headquarters, including 2 Districts; Western Command, with Chester as Headquarters, including 2 Districts.

The British Army was organized with a view to providing an Expeditionary Force for service abroad in the event of war. This force, about 160,000 strong, consisted of 6 Divisions, with a Cavalry Division and additional Cavalry Brigades, besides Army Troops and Line of Communication Troops. The Division is a completely equipped force of all arms, just over 18,000 strong. It comprises 3 Infantry Brigades, 1 Squadron of Cavalry, 4 Brigades of Field Artillery, 1 Heavy

Battery, 1 Divisional Ammunition Column, 2 Field Companies of Engineers, 1 Signal Company, 1 Divisional Train, and 3 Field Ambulances. It carries 54 18-pounder guns, 18 howitzers, 4 60-pounder guns, and 24 machine-guns. An Infantry Brigade comprises 4 Infantry Battalions, and is just over 4000 strong. The Cavalry Division consists of 4 Cavalry Brigades, 2 Brigades of Horse Artillery, 1 Field Squadron of Engineers, 1 Signal Squadron, and 4 Cavalry Field Ambulances, in all nearly 9300 officers and men. A Cavalry Brigade when forming part of a Cavalry Division consists of 3 Cavalry Regiments (= 9 Squadrons) and a Signal Troop, with a total strength of just over 1700 officers and men. An independent Cavalry Brigade comprises 3 Cavalry Regiments (= 9 Squadrons), 1 Horse Artillery Battery, 1 Field Troop of Engineers, 1 Signal Troop, and 1 Cavalry Field Ambulance, in all nearly 2300 strong. A Brigade of Field Artillery consists of 3 Batteries (= 18 guns) with Ammunition Column, and a Brigade of Horse Artillery of 2 Batteries (= 4 guns) with Ammunition Column. The 6 Divisions of the Expeditionary Force were grouped in 3 Army Corps, each including 2 Divisions with Army Troops, in all about 40,000 officers and men.

MINOR EUROPEAN BELLIGERENT ARMIES.—The Serbian Army, though small, entered upon the war with Austria as an efficient force which had gained experience of war under modern conditions, and which had behind it the prestige of recent victory in two campaigns. All male Serbs were liable for military service between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five. From twenty-one to thirty-one they belonged to the First Ban or Active Army, the first one and a half or two years being spent with the colours and the remainder of the period in the Reserve. They next passed to the Second Ban for six years, with occasional short trainings, and finally for eight years to the Third Ban, a kind of Territorial Army. The army was organized in 10 Divisional districts, with headquarters as follows:—

I—Nish; II—Valievo; III—Belgrade; IV—Kraguyevatz; V—Zajechar; VI—Skoplie (Uskub); VII—Shtip; VIII—Novibazar; IX—Bitoli (Monastir); X—Prishtina.

Of these VI–X were formed out of the territories annexed after the Balkan Wars of 1912–3, and of these annexed areas only VIII was mainly Serb in population. The other annexed areas were predominantly Bulgarian. A Division comprised 2 Brigades = 4 Regiments = 16 Battalions of Infantry. Of the 4 Battalions of a Regiment one was organized in wartime only as a feeder for the other three. Each Division included also a Regiment of Artillery, consisting of 9 Batteries of 6 guns each. Divisional Cavalry was organized only in war, but there was a permanent Cavalry Division of 2 Brigades = 4 Regiments = 16 Squadrons, one Brigade being at Belgrade and one at Nish. There was also a Regiment of Mountain Artillery and 2 Batteries of Horse Artillery. The peace strength of the Serbian Army was 38,316 in 1913, and the war strength was about 325,000, of whom about 170,000

The Story of the Great War

belonged to the First Ban and 100,000 to the Second Ban. The Serbian Army was handicapped by the poverty of its technical equipment, and the difficulty of obtaining supplies of munitions of war so long as Greece remained neutral.

Montenegro is practically a nation of soldiers, with war as its chief national business, but the Montenegrin army, nevertheless, does not rank high in efficiency for war under modern conditions. Every male Montenegrin is liable to military service from the age of nineteen to the age of sixty-two. For two years he is trained as a recruit, after which he is passed into the Active Army, where he receives a certain amount of training each year. From the age of fifty-two till the end of his liability he belongs to a kind of reserve militia. The army is organized in 4 Divisions, with the towns of Cetinje, Podgoritz, Nikšić, and Kolachine as headquarters. The number of brigades in these divisions is 11, and the total number of battalions 56. There is a brigade of field artillery, but no cavalry. The total war strength of the army is about 40,000, equal to one Army Corps of a great Power. Montenegro is of importance in the war only as an ally of the kindred Serbian state, for which it provides an access to the sea.

At the outbreak of the war the Belgian army was in a transition stage. A law of 1913, passed in consequence of the alarm created by the Morocco crisis of 1911, had introduced the principle of universal liability for military service, and had provided for about half of the annual contingent of recruits being trained. Substitution by payment was abolished. The term of service in the Active Army and its Reserve was eight years, of which fifteen months in the infantry or two years in the cavalry was the period of continuous active training. During the remainder of the eight years the citizen was liable to undergo short annual periods of training. From the Active Army and its Reserve the citizen soldier passed into the second-line Reserve for five years. Volunteers were also enlisted for periods from three to seven years. There was also a semi-military Gendarmerie and a Civic Guard. The latter was a survival of an old National Guard, dating from the revolution of 1830 by which the kingdom was founded, and in theory comprised every Belgian who was not in the other classes of the army. Its members found their own uniforms and elected their own officers. The law of 1913 would in time have absorbed it into the more regular national army, but this process was not complete at the outbreak of war, and the more or less trained part of the Civic Guard was employed on the lines of communication and in the fortresses. The Belgian army was organized in 6 Divisions, with headquarters in Ghent, Antwerp, Liège, Namur, Mons, and Brussels, and a Cavalry Division at Brussels. Each Division, with an establishment of about 22,000, consisted of 3 Mixed Brigades, each Brigade comprising 2 Infantry Regiments of 3 Battalions each and 3 Field Artillery Batteries of 4 guns; and Divisional Troops, including 3 Field Artillery Batteries and 6 Howitzer Batteries, a Regiment of Cavalry, &c. These Belgian Divisions corresponded to the Army Corps of the larger countries, and their Brigades to Divisions.

The Cavalry Division comprised 3 Brigades = 6 Regiments = 24 Squadrons, 3 Batteries of Horse Artillery, and auxiliary troops. In addition there were the fortress troops, which amounted to no less than 130,000 out of a total strength of about 340,000. The peace strength of the army was 47,603 in 1913.

At the outbreak of the Great War the Turkish army was in a rather chaotic state in consequence of the Balkan wars of 1912-3, and precise information regarding it can hardly be obtained. Every Moslem was liable for military service, and Christians were being incorporated in the army to a certain extent in recent years. The period of service in the Active Army (Nizam) was three years; then followed six years in the reserve of the Active Army (Ihtiat), nine years in the Territorial Army (Redif), and two years in the Territorial Reserve (Mustahfiz). There was also a sort of Ersatz Reserve, as in Germany, for those of the annual contingent who could not be taken into the Active Army.

MILITARY WEAPONS OF THE BELLIGERENT POWERS.—The chief arm of the infantry in every modern army is a magazine rifle. France uses a tube magazine for eight cartridges, but all the other Powers use a box magazine taking five cartridges (ten in the case of Britain). Germany employs the Mauser of 1898 pattern, with a calibre of .311 inch; Turkey, Serbia, and Belgium also use a form of Mauser rifle. France employs the Lebel rifle, of .315-inch calibre; Britain the short Lee-Enfield of .303-inch; Russia the 3-line Nagant of 1894, with a calibre of .3 inch; and Austria the Mannlicher of 1895, with a calibre of .315 inch. In 1905 Germany introduced a pointed bullet, and in this she has been followed by France and some other Powers. All modern rifles are adapted for taking a sword bayonet. The machine-gun, which is regarded as equivalent in effect to 100 or more rifles, is usually of rifle calibre. It is automatic in action and can fire a large number of bullets in quick succession, the only limitation on its operation being the heating of the water-jacket which is required to cool the barrel. The British type is known, from its inventor, as the Maxim gun; this type is also used by Russia and Germany. France has adopted the Hotchkiss type for its mitrailleuses, as its machine-guns are called. The Austrians have adopted a very modern type called the Schwarzlose. Cavalry are usually armed with a carbine, which is a smaller weapon of the same type as the rifle, in addition, of course, to the lance and sabre.

The ordinary gun of the field artillery in all great armies is a quick-firing gun of about 3-in. calibre, weighing 7 to 9 tons. By quick-firing is meant that the carriage is fixed, and the gun, after firing, recoils along the carriage until brought to rest and returned to firing position by an automatic mechanism. The British field-artillery gun is an 18-pounder of 3.3-in. calibre; the French a 7.5-cm. (75 mm.) gun firing a shot of 15 lb.; the German a 3-in.-calibre gun with a shot of 15 lb.; the Austrian a 14½-pounder gun of 3-in. calibre; the Russian a 13½-pounder of 3-in. calibre; and the Belgian a Krupp gun similar to the German. The French gun is the original quick-firer, and still


The Story of the Great War

one of the best; the British and Russian guns are also good; but the German field-guns are inferior, because only adapted from an older type to a quick-firing carriage. All modern field-guns have a protective shield. Some countries, notably Britain, equip the horse artillery with a lighter, more mobile gun, but Germany has never done so. The British horse-artillery gun is a 13-pounder of 3-in. calibre.

The British field-howitzer, of 4.5-in. calibre, is a quick-firer discharging a projectile of 40 lb. France has a 12-cm. field-howitzer, Germany a 30-pounder, Russia a 35-pounder, and Austria a 30-pounder. Howitzers are guns adapted for high-angle fire, instead of the flat-trajectory fire of the ordinary field-gun. Heavy batteries are equipped with heavier howitzers. The British heavy gun is the 60-pounder of 5-in. calibre; the French is a 94-pounder (Rimailho) of 15.5-cm. calibre; the German a 94-pounder of 15-cm. calibre; the Austrian an 80-pounder of 6-in. calibre; and the Russians have also a 6-in. howitzer. There are also still more powerful howitzers for siege and similar operations, e.g. the British 6-in. howitzer, with a projectile of 120 lb.; the French 10.7-in. howitzer; the Russian 12-in. howitzer; the Austrian 12-in. howitzer, with a shell of 800 lb.; and the German 8.2-in. and 11-in. howitzers, the latter with a projectile of 700 lb., besides the famous 17-in. (42-cm.) howitzer, which was one of the surprises of the war. These very heavy guns require to be mounted on concrete beds.

FORTIFICATIONS AND FRONTIER DEFENCES.—The western frontier of Germany has in the southern part a strong natural line of defence in the Vosges mountains, but the strongest line is the Rhine, with its seven modern fortresses at important points. These are, in order from north to south, Wesel, Cologne, Coblenz, Mainz, Germersheim, Strassburg, and Neu-Breisach. Metz and Diedenhofen (Thionville) are two strong fortresses in Lorraine forming a more advanced line of defence, and Bitsch is a less important stronghold just west of the northern end of the Vosges. On the eastern frontier the southern part of East Prussia is well protected by its extraordinary network of irregular lakes, called the Masurian Lakes, and farther north there is the fortress of Königsberg and the minor fort of Boyen. The real defence, however, is the line of the lower Vistula, which is guarded by the fortresses of Thorn and Graudenz, whilst Danzig may be reckoned as completing this line of defence. A second line of defence, the River Warta, is guarded by fortified Posen, and Glogau and Breslau guard the line of the River Oder. Glatz is a fortress commanding the way from Moravia into the province of Silesia. The River Danube forms a strong natural line of defence in the south, and is commanded by forts at Ulm and Ingolstadt. The coast defences along the North Sea and the Baltic will be noted in the following chapter in connection with the naval position.

On her western frontier Russia has in Poland a salient projecting between German East Prussia on the north and Austrian Galicia on the south. An advance straight into Germany cannot be undertaken from here until these flanks have been effectually secured. The chief



A GERMAN 8.2-INCH (21-cm.) SIEGE MORTAR WITH "CATERPILLAR" WHEELS

This was one of the chief heavy guns used against Belgian and French forts

NEWARK, N. J., MAY 10, 1918

defensive lines of Poland are rivers, notably the central Vistula. The so-called Polish quadrilateral consists of four fortresses, namely, Warsaw, Ivangorod, and Novo-Georgievsk on the Vistula, and Brest-Litovsk on the Bug, the last being a large fortified camp serving as a base for Russian operations in this district. Grodno and Kovno are fortresses guarding the line of the Niemen, which is in part a frontier river, and Ossowiec helps to secure the Bober, a sub-tributary of the Vistula. Dvinsk strengthens the line of the River Dvina, and Kiev that of the Dnieper. Alexandropol and Kars are strongholds in the Caucasus. The German side of the Polish frontier is well supplied with strategic railways, but not the Russian side. This fact was to prove of decisive importance in the Russo-German campaign. Fortified places of naval importance will be noted in the following chapter.

The Franco-German frontier was very strongly fortified on the French side. Belfort commanded the Gap of Belfort, between the Vosges and the Jura; Épinal and Toul were very powerful fortresses on the upper Moselle; and Verdun was a similarly strong place on the upper Meuse. The line between Belfort and Épinal, and that between Toul and Verdun, were secured by a chain of *forts d'arrêt*, and the gap between Épinal and Toul was, of course, barred by the Moselle. The Belgian frontier of France was much more weakly held, the chief strongholds being Maubeuge and Lille, although the latter was to prove of no consequence in the actual operations. Longwy was a little French fort near where France, Belgium, and Luxemburg all meet, facing a gap opening into France from Luxemburg. The chief fortresses on the Italian frontier were Grenoble and Briançon, with Lyons as a support. Paris was strongly held by several lines of encircling forts, and was prepared to endure a prolonged siege if necessary.

Belgium, having long feared that either France or Germany would attack the other along the valley of the Meuse and Sambre, in violation of Belgian neutrality, had constructed powerful modern ring fortresses at Liège and Namur to block this route. She had also in Antwerp one of the strongest fortresses in Europe, with an elaborate series of successive lines of forts. All these defences were constructed according to the theories and designs of the famous Belgian military engineer, Henri Alexis Brialmont. Further particulars of these three fortified places will be given in later chapters, in connection with the story of the military operations in Belgium.

For the defence of Galicia against Russia Austria had the fortresses of Przemyśl and Cracow, although her real defence here was the line of the Carpathian Mountains, which guarded the plains of Hungary; against Italy she would be aided by the fortresses of Trent and Riva, the latter at the head of Lake Garda; Serajevo, the capital of Bosnia, was fortified; and in Herzegovina there were fortresses at Mostar, Trebinje, and Bileca. Hungary had a fortress at Komorn, on the Danube; Croatia-Slavonia was defended by Peterwardein; and in Transylvania there was the stronghold of Gyulafehérvár or Karlsburg. Belgrade was the only fortified place in Serbia.

The Story of the Great War

TABLE SHOWING MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE BELLIGERENTS
AND SOME OTHER STATES

State.	Total Population.	Male Population.	Maximum Military Strength. ¹	Peace Strength.	War Strength.
Germany.....	65,000,000	32,000,000	12,000,000	791,000	5,000,000
Austria-Hungary	52,000,000	25,500,000	9,560,000	425,000	4,000,000
France.....	40,000,000	19,500,000	7,310,000	618,000	4,000,000
Russia.....	171,000,000 (153,000,000) ²	85,650,000 (76,000,000) ²	32,120,000 (28,500,000) ³	1,380,000	4,000,000
Britain ³	46,000,000	22,400,000	8,400,000	235,000	800,000
Belgium	7,500,000	3,700,000	1,390,000	48,000	340,000
Serbia.....	4,500,000	2,250,000	840,000	39,000	330,000
Montenegro.....	520,000	260,000	98,000	—	40,000
Turkey	21,000,000	10,000,000	3,750,000	230,000	500,000
Italy.....	36,000,000	17,500,000	6,560,000	305,000	3,450,000
Roumania.....	7,500,000	3,700,000	1,390,000	106,000	350,000
Bulgaria.....	4,750,000	2,400,000	900,000	60,000	300,000
Greece... ..	4,400,000	2,200,000	830,000	26,000	300,000
Japan ⁴	52,000,000	26,000,000	9,750,000	250,000	2,000,000

¹ Maximum military strength is taken here as represented by the total male population between the ages of nineteen and forty, which is calculated at 37½ per cent of the total male population of all ages. This percentage was obtained from the British census tables.

² The figures in parentheses opposite Russia refer to Russia in Europe and Transcaucasia, the other figures to the whole Russian Empire.

³ The British figures are for the United Kingdom only.

⁴ Excludes Japanese colonies.

CHAPTER II

THE NAVAL POSITION AT THE OUTBREAK OF WAR

THE BRITISH NAVY.—The administration of Lord Fisher as First Sea Lord of the Admiralty during 1904-10 made an epoch in the history of the British navy, and in naval development throughout the world. The *Dreadnought*, laid down in 1905 and completed in 1906, was a new type of battleship, beside which even the finest ships constructed before it were comparatively antiquated, though by no means worthless. From that time the fighting strength of a navy was measured by the number of its Dreadnoughts, and other battleships were to be regarded as a kind of reserve or supplementary strength. The noteworthy features of the *Dreadnought* as compared with the *Lord Nelson*, the finest of the pre-Dreadnoughts, are (1) its all-big-gun armament (ten 12-inch guns as against four 12-inch and ten 9.2-inch guns), with smaller anti-torpedo-boat guns additional in both cases; (2) its turbine engines and much greater horse-power, resulting in substantially higher speed (21.8 knots as against 18.9). Immediately after the completion of the *Dreadnought* another new type of ship, the battle-cruiser, was introduced, the first examples being the *Invincible*, *Inflexible*, and *Indomitable*. These are of Dreadnought type, but differ in having a rather lighter armament of

big guns (eight 12-inch), and in developing substantially greater speed (26 knots). They can take their place in line of battle, and their great speed enables them to reach a scene of action quickly. The *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Warspite*, laid down in 1912, and completed after the start of the war, are battleships of Dreadnought, or rather super-Dreadnought type, constructed for the use of oil fuel alone.

With these introductory words, we shall now enumerate the effective ships of the British navy at the outbreak of war, according to their various classes, giving the necessary particulars of armament, speed, &c.

DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 34 built and building.

(a) Dreadnought class, comprising only *Dreadnought* (completed 1906), with ten 12-inch and twenty-four 12-pounder quick-firing guns; 21.8 knots. Broadside = eight guns; ahead or astern fire = six guns.

(b) Bellerophon class (completed 1909), comprising *Bellerophon*, *Téméraire*, *Superb*; differ from (a) chiefly in minor anti-torpedo-craft or mosquito armament, which consists of sixteen 4-inch and four 3-pounder guns.

(c) St. Vincent class (completed 1910), comprising *St. Vincent*, *Collingwood*, *Vanguard*; differ from (b) chiefly in having eighteen instead of sixteen 4-inch guns.

(d) Colossus class (completed 1911), comprising *Colossus*, *Hercules*, *Neptune*; armament as in (b), but barbettes arranged to give broadside of all ten guns, astern fire of eight, and ahead fire of six.

(e) Orion class (completed 1911-2), comprising *Orion*, *Thunderer*, *Monarch*, *Conqueror*; began super-Dreadnought development; armament of ten 13.5-inch, sixteen 4-inch, and four 3-pounder guns; all big guns on centre line.

(f) King George V class (completed 1912-3), comprising *King George V*, *Ajax*, *Audacious*, *Centurion*; differ from (e) only in being slightly larger.

(g) Iron Duke class (completed 1914), comprising *Iron Duke*, *Marlborough*, *Benbow*, *Emperor of India*; differ from (e) and (f) in minor armament, which is twelve 6-inch, two 3-inch, and four 3-pounder guns.

(h) Queen Elizabeth class (to be completed 1914-5), comprising *Queen Elizabeth*, *Warspite*, *Valiant*, *Malaya*, *Barham*; large vessels (27,500 tons displacement); speed 25 knots; armament of eight 15-inch, sixteen 6-inch, and twelve 12-pounder guns; for oil fuel.

(i) Royal Sovereign class (to be completed 1915), comprising *Royal Sovereign*, *Royal Oak*, *Resolution*, *Revenge*, *Ramillies*; 29,000 tons; 22 knots; ten 15-inch, sixteen 6-inch, and twelve 12-pounder guns.

(j) *Agincourt*, completing for Turkey in Britain at outbreak of war, but taken over by British Government; similar in size and speed to *Queen Elizabeth*.

Erin, completing for Turkey, and taken over by Britain; similar to *King George V*.

DREADNOUGHT BATTLE-CRUISERS: 10 built and building.

(a) Invincible class (completed 1908-9), comprising *Invincible*, *Inflexible*, *Indomitable*; the original battle-cruisers; 25 knots; eight 12-inch, sixteen 4-inch, and four 3-pounder guns.

(b) Indefatigable class (completed 1911-2), comprising *Indefatigable*, *New Zealand*, and *Australia*; like (a) but rather larger and somewhat improved.

The Story of the Great War

(c) *Lion* class (completed 1911-2), comprising *Lion* and *Princess Royal*; speed 28 knots; much larger than (a) and (b); armament, eight 13.5-inch and sixteen 4-inch guns.

(d) *Queen Mary* class (completed 1913-4), comprising *Queen Mary* and *Tiger*; 27,000 tons; speed 30 knots or so; armament of *Queen Mary* as in (c), but *Tiger* has twelve 6-inch instead of sixteen 4-inch guns.

PRE-DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 40 in commission.

(a) *Majestic* class (completed 1895-8), comprising *Majestic*, *Magnificent*, *Hannibal*, *Prince George*, *Victorious*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Cæsar*, *Illustrious*; the oldest battleships on the British active list; armament four 12-inch, twelve 6-inch, sixteen 12-pounder, and four 3-pounder guns.

(b) *Canopus* class (completed 1899-1902), comprising *Canopus*, *Albion*, *Glory*, *Goliath*, *Ocean*, *Vengeance*; four 12-inch, twelve 6-inch, ten 12-pounder, and six 3-pounder guns.

(c) *Formidable* class (completed 1901-2), comprising *Formidable*, *Irresistible*, *Implacable*; larger than preceding; four 12-inch, twelve 6-inch, sixteen 12-pounder, and two 3-pounder guns.

(d) *London* class (completed 1902-4); comprising *London*, *Bulwark*, *Venerable*; similar to (c).

(e) *Queen* class (completed 1902-4); comprising *Queen* and *Prince of Wales*; similar to (c).

(f) *Duncan* class (completed 1903-4), comprising *Duncan*, *Russell*, *Albemarle*, *Cornwallis*, *Exmouth*; armament practically as in (b).

(g) *Swiftsure* class (completed 1904), comprising *Swiftsure* and *Triumph*, taken over from Chile; armament four 10-inch, fourteen 7.5-inch, fourteen 14-pounder, and four 6-pounder guns.

(h) *King Edward* class (completed 1905-6), comprising *King Edward VII*, *Commonwealth*, *Dominion*, *Hindustan*, *Zealandia*, *Hibernia*, *Africa*, *Britannia*; larger and faster than earlier pre-Dreadnoughts; armament four 12-inch, four 9.2-inch, ten 6-inch, twelve 12-pounder, and twelve 3-pounder guns.

(i) *Lord Nelson* class (completed 1908), comprising *Lord Nelson* and *Agamemnon*; the finest pre-Dreadnoughts; armament four 12-inch, ten 9.2-inch, twenty-four 12-pounder, and two 3-pounder guns.

ARMoured CRUISERS: 34 in commission.

(a) *Cressy* class (completed 1901-4), comprising *Cressy*, *Aboukir*, *Bacchante*, *Euryalus*, *Hogue*, *Sutlej*; 12,000 tons; 21 knots; two 9.2-inch and twelve 6-inch guns.

(b) *Drake* class (completed 1902-3), comprising *Drake*, *Good Hope*, *King Alfred*, *Leviathan*; 14,100 tons; 24 knots; two 9.2-inch and sixteen 6-inch guns.

(c) *Monmouth* class (completed 1903-5), comprising *Monmouth*, *Donegal*, *Essex*, *Kent*, *Lancaster*, *Suffolk*, *Berwick*, *Cornwall*, *Cumberland*; 9800 tons; 23 knots; fourteen 6-inch and eight 12-pounder guns.

(d) *Devonshire* class (completed 1905-6), comprising *Devonshire*, *Hampshire*, *Roxburgh*, *Carnarvon*, *Argyll*, and *Antrim*; 10,800 tons; 23 knots; four 7.5-inch and six 6-inch guns.

(e) *Duke of Edinburgh* class (completed 1906), comprising *Duke of Edinburgh* and *Black Prince*; 13,500 tons; 23 knots; six 9.2-inch and six 6-inch guns.

(f) Warrior class (completed 1906-7); comprising *Warrior*, *Achilles*, *Cochrane*, *Natal*; 13,500 tons; 23 knots; six 9.2-inch and four 3-pounder guns.

(g) Minotaur class (completed 1908-9), comprising *Minotaur*, *Defence*, *Shannon*; 14,600 tons; 23 knots; four 9.2-inch and ten 7.5-inch guns.

PROTECTED CRUISERS: 17 in commission.

(a) Royal Arthur class (completed 1893), comprising *Royal Arthur* and *Crescent*; 7700 tons; 20 knots; one 9-inch and twelve 6-inch guns.

(b) Edgar class (completed 1893-4), comprising *Edgar*, *Endymion*, *Grafton*, *Gibraltar*, *Hawke*, *St. George*, and *Theseus*; 7300 tons; 20 knots; two 9-inch and ten 6-inch guns.

(c) *Terrible* (1898); 14,200 tons; 22 knots; two 9.2-inch and sixteen 6-inch guns.

(d) Diadem class (completed 1899-1902), comprising *Diadem*, *Europa*, *Ariadne*, *Argonaut*, *Andromeda*, *Amphitrite*, *Spartiate*; 11,000 tons; 21 knots; sixteen 6-inch and twelve 12-pounder guns.

Add to above four Australian, namely, *Melbourne*, *Sydney*, *Brisbane*, and *Encounter*, and two Canadian, namely, *Niobe* and *Rainbow*.

LIGHT CRUISERS: 79 in commission.

The tonnage of these cruisers varies from about 2100 to about 5800, their speed from 20 to 30 knots, and their heaviest guns are 6-inch. In 1912-3 a new class was introduced which was protected by side armour of 3 inches thickness. Their armament consists of two 6-inch and six 4-inch guns. These ships are as follows:—

Arethusa, *Aurora*, *Galatea*, *Inconstant*, *Royalist*, *Penelope*, *Phaeton*, *Undaunted*. At the outbreak of war eight more were building of the same type, but with three 6-inch guns. These were *Champion*, *Caroline*, *Cordelia*, *Comus*, *Cleopatra*, *Conquest*, *Calliope*, and *Carysfort*.

OTHER VESSELS.

These include 108 Torpedo-boat Destroyers, dating from 1895 to 1905, mostly armed with one 12-pounder and five 6-pounders, but with four 12-pounders in the more recent; 130 of the larger Ocean-going Destroyers, dating from 1907 to 1914, most of them armed with two or three 4-inch quick-firing guns; 94 Torpedo Boats, dating from 1886 to 1909, armed usually with two or three 3-pounders or two 12-pounders; and 96 Submarines, dating from 1903 to 1914, of which the latest type (F) has a tonnage of 1000, six torpedo-tubes, and two 3-inch guns.

Just before the war the main force of the British navy, called the Home Fleet, consisted of three Fleets, of which the first was maintained at full strength and ready for any emergency, whilst the second was manned by nucleus crews, and the third by reduced nucleus crews. On mobilization all crews were made up to full strength, so that all three fleets should be ready for service in home waters. The flagship of the Commander-in-Chief was the *Iron Duke*, and the fleets were made up as follows:—

The Story of the Great War

FIRST FLEET

FIRST BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Marlborough, St. Vincent, Colossus, Hercules, Neptune, Vanguard, Collingwood, Superb* (all Dreadnoughts).

SECOND BATTLE SQUADRON.—*King George V, Orion, Ajax, Audacious, Centurion, Conqueror, Monarch, Thunderer* (all super-Dreadnoughts).

THIRD BATTLE SQUADRON.—*King Edward VII, Hibernia, Africa, Britannia, Commonwealth, Dominion, Hindustan, Zealandia* (all pre-Dreadnoughts of latest type).

FOURTH BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Dreadnought, Téméraire, Bellerophon, Agamemnon* (mostly Dreadnoughts).

FIRST BATTLE-CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Lion, Queen Mary, Princess Royal, New Zealand* (all Dreadnoughts).

SECOND CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Shannon, Achilles, Cochrane, Natal.*

THIRD CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Antrim, Argyll, Devonshire, Roxburgh.*

FOURTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Suffolk, Berwick, Essex, Lancaster, Bristol.*

FIRST LIGHT-CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Southampton, Birmingham, Lowestoft, Nottingham.*

SECOND FLEET

FIFTH BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Prince of Wales, Bulwark, Formidable, Implacable, Irresistible, London, Queen, Venerable.*

SIXTH BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Lord Nelson, Russell, Cornwallis, Albemarle, Duncan, Exmouth, Vengeance.*

FIFTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Carnarvon, Falmouth, Liverpool.*

SIXTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Drake, Good Hope, King Alfred, Leviathan.*

THIRD FLEET

SEVENTH BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Cæsar, Illustrious, Magnificent, Prince George, Victorious.*

EIGHTH BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Albion, Canopus, Glory, Goliath, Ocean.*

SEVENTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Cressy, Euryalus, Hogue, Sutlej.*

EIGHTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—Not constituted.

NINTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Donegal, Monmouth, Amphitrite, Challenger, Europa, Highflyer, Vindictive.*

TENTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Crescent, Edgar, Endymion, Gibraltar, Grafton, Hawke, Royal Arthur, Theseus.*

ELEVENTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Doris, Isis, Juno, Minerva, Venus.*

TWELFTH CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Charybdis, Diana, Eclipse, Talbot.*

The British fleet in the Mediterranean was constituted as follows:—

SECOND BATTLE-CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Inflexible, Indefatigable, Indomitable, Invincible.*

FIRST CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Defence, Black Prince, Duke of Edinburgh, Warrior.*

LIGHT CRUISERS.—*Chatham, Dublin, Gloucester, Weymouth.*

Besides these there were the flotillas of destroyers, the patrol flotillas of destroyers and torpedo boats, the submarine flotillas, and the squadrons in East Indian, Chinese, and Australasian waters.





Photo Cribb

H.M.S. IRON DUKE
Flagship of the British Grand Fleet



GERMAN BATTLESHIP FRIEDRICH DER GROSSE
Flagship of the German High Seas Fleet

THE GERMAN NAVY.—The German navy has become in recent years the second navy of the world. The introduction of the *Dreadnought* in 1905-6, by enormously reducing the value of all previous battleships, enabled Germany to start more nearly level with Britain in a race for naval supremacy than she could ever have done before that time. The result has been a very keen naval rivalry and a consequent increasing tension in Brito-German relations, which have contributed materially to the causation of the Great War. In adopting the Dreadnought type of battleship, Germany has not reduced the minor armament so much as Britain, and accordingly her ships are somewhat of a compromise between the new and the old systems of battleship design. At the outbreak of war she had not a single super-Dreadnought completed. The German fleet at the outbreak of war may be summarized as follows:—

DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 20 built and building.

(a) Westfalen class (completed 1909-10), comprising *Westfalen*, *Nassau*, *Rheinland*, *Posen*; twelve 11-inch, twelve 5.9-inch, and sixteen 3.4-inch guns; just over 20 knots.

(b) Thüringen class (completed 1911-2), comprising *Thüringen*, *Ostfriesland*, *Helgoland*, *Oldenburg*; twelve 12-inch, fourteen 5.9-inch, and fourteen 3.4-inch guns; speed over 21 and 22 knots.

(c) Kaiser class (completed 1912-3), comprising *Kaiser*, *Friedrich der Grosse*, *Kaiserin*, *König Albrecht*, *Prinz-Regent Luitpold*; ten 12-inch, fourteen 5.9-inch, and twelve 3.4-inch guns; 21-3 knots.

(d) König class (launched 1913 and 1914), comprising *König*, *Grosser Kurfürst*, *Markgraf*, *Kronprinz*; ten 12-inch, fourteen 5.9-inch, and twelve 3-pounder guns; 23 knots.

(e) New Super-Dreadnoughts (building at outbreak of war), comprising *Ersatz Wörth* (i.e. ship to replace the *Wörth*), "*T*", *Ersatz Kaiser Friedrich III*; eight 15-inch and sixteen 6-inch guns.

DREADNOUGHT BATTLE-CRUISERS: 8 in all.

Von der Tann (completed 1911); eight 11-inch, ten 5.9-inch, and sixteen 3.4-inch guns; 27.6 knots.

Moltke, *Goeben*, *Seydlitz* (completed 1911-3); ten 11-inch, twelve 5.9-inch, and twelve 3.4-inch guns; 28-9 knots.

Derfflinger (completed 1914); eight 12-inch, twelve 5.9-inch, and twelve 3.4-inch guns; 27 knots; other similar ships building in 1914 were *Lützow*, *Ersatz Hertha*, *Ersatz Viktoria Luise*.

PRE-DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 20 in all.

(a) Kaiser class (completed 1899-1902), comprising *Kaiser Friedrich III*, *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, *Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse*, *Kaiser Barbarossa*, *Kaiser Karl der Grosse*; four 9.4-inch, eighteen 5.9-inch, twelve 3.4-inch, and twelve 1.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(b) Wittelsbach class (completed 1902-3), comprising *Wittelsbach*, *Mecklenburg*, *Zähringen*, *Wettin*, *Schwaben*; four 9.4-inch, eighteen 5.9-inch, twelve 3.4-inch, and twelve 1.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(c) Braunschweig class (completed 1904-5), comprising *Braunschweig*,

Elsass, Preussen, Lothringen, Hessen; four 11-inch, fourteen 6.7-inch, and eighteen 3.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(d) Deutschland class (completed 1906-8), comprising *Deutschland, Hannover, Pommern, Schleswig-Holstein*, and *Schlesien*; four 11-inch, fourteen 6.7-inch, twenty-two 3.4-inch, and four 1.4-inch guns; 18.5 knots.

ARMoured CRUISERS: 9 in all.

Fürst Bismarck (1900); four 9.4-inch and twelve 6-inch guns.

Prinz Heinrich (1902); two 9.4-inch and ten 6-inch guns.

Prinz Adalbert (1903) and *Friedrich Karl* (1904); four 8.2-inch, ten 5.9-inch, twelve 3.4-inch, and three 1.4-inch guns.

Roon (1905) and *Yorck* (1905); four 8.2-inch, ten 5.9-inch, fourteen 3.4-inch, and three 1.4-inch guns.

Scharnhorst (1908) and *Gneisenau* (1908); eight 8.2-inch, six 5.9-inch, and twenty 3.4-inch guns.

Blücher (1910); twelve 8.2-inch, eight 5.9-inch, and sixteen 3.4-inch guns.

PROTECTED CRUISERS: 46 in all.

(a) *Gefion* (completed 1894); ten 4.1-inch and six 2.1-inch guns.

(b) *Kaiserin Augusta* (completed 1896); twelve 5.9-inch and eight 3.4-inch guns.

(c) Freya class (completed 1898-9), comprising *Freya, Hertha, Viktoria Luise, Vineta, Hansa*; two 8.2-inch, six 5.9-inch, and fourteen 3.4-inch guns.

(d) Gazelle class (completed 1898-1901), comprising *Gazelle, Niobe, Nympe*; ten 4.1-inch guns.

(e) Ariadne class (completed 1901), comprising *Ariadne, Amazone, Medusa, Thetis*; ten 4.1-inch guns.

(f) Frauenlob class (completed 1903-4), comprising *Frauenlob, Arcona, Undine*; ten 4.1-inch guns.

(g) Bremen class (completed 1904-7), comprising *Bremen, Berlin, Lübeck, Hamburg, München, Leipzig, Danzig*, ten 4.1-inch guns; 23 knots.

(h) Königsberg class (completed 1907-8), comprising *Königsberg, Stuttgart, Nürnberg, Stettin*; ten 4.1-inch and eight 2.1-inch guns; 23.5 knots.

(i) Emden class (completed 1908-9), comprising *Emden* and *Dresden*; ten 4.1-inch and four 2.1-inch guns; 25 knots.

(j) Kolberg class (completed 1910), comprising *Kolberg, Mainz, Köln, Augsburg*; twelve 4.1-inch and four 2.1-inch guns; 25.5 knots.

(k) Strassburg class (completed 1912-3), comprising *Strassburg, Breslau, Magdeburg, Stralsund, Karlsruhe, Rostock*, and *Graudenz*; twelve 4.1-inch guns; 27 knots.

(l) *Ersatz Irene, Ersatz Gefion, Ersatz Hela, Ersatz Gazelle*, and *Ersatz Niobe* building.

OTHER VESSELS.

These include 152 Destroyers, dating from 1888 to 1914, the earlier ones armed with 3-pounders mostly, the later (from 1906) with two 23-pounders; 47 Torpedo Boats; and 39 Submarines.

At the outbreak of war the German High Sea Fleet, which is distributed between the North Sea and the Baltic, with the recently widened and deepened Kaiser Wilhelm Canal as a means of intercommunication, was constituted nearly as follows:—

• FLEET FLAGSHIP: *Friedrich der Grosse*

FIRST BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Ostfriesland, Thüringen, Helgoland, Oldenburg, Nassau, Rheinland, Posen, Westfalen* (all Dreadnoughts).

SECOND BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Preussen, Schleswig-Holstein, Pommern, Hannover, Hessen, Schlesien, Lothringen, Deutschland*.

THIRD BATTLE SQUADRON.—*Kaiser, Kaiserin, König Albrecht, Prinz-Regent Luitpold* (all Dreadnoughts).

RESERVE SQUADRON.—*Wittelsbach, Braunschweig, Elsass, Zähringen*.

BATTLE-CRUISER SQUADRON.—*Seydlitz, Goeben, Von der Tann, Moltke*.

A number of cruisers were in foreign waters at the opening of the war, notably the *Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, Leipzig, Dresden, Emden, Breslau, Nürnberg*, and *Karlsruhe*. The battle cruiser *Goeben* was stationed in the Mediterranean along with the *Breslau* when the war began.

THE FRENCH NAVY.—France, like Germany, followed the British lead in battleship construction, but her first Dreadnought was not laid down till 1910, and at the outbreak of war none of her super-Dreadnoughts had been completed. France has no battle-cruisers like those in the British and German fleets. The principal vessels of her navy were as follows at the opening of the war:—

DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 12 in all built or building.

(a) Jean Bart class (completed 1913-4), comprising *Jean Bart, Courbet, France, Paris*; 23,400 tons; twelve 12-inch, twenty-two 5.5-inch, and four (or eight) 3-pounder guns; 20 knots.

(b) Bretagne class (completed 1914), comprising *Bretagne, Lorraine, Provence*; 23,550 tons; ten 13.4-inch, twenty-two 5.5-inch, and eight small quick-firing guns; 20 knots.

(c) Béarn class (laid down 1913), comprising *Béarn, Gascogne, Flandre, Languedoc, Normandie*; 25,000 tons; twelve 13.4-inch, twenty-four 5.5-inch, and four 3-pounder guns; 21 knots.

PRE-DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 21 in all.

(a) *Jauréguiberry* (completed 1896); two 12-inch, two 10.8-inch, eight 5.5-inch, four 2.5-inch, twelve 1.8-inch, and eight 1.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(b) Charles Martel class (completed 1897), comprising *Charles Martel* and *Carnot*; two 12-inch, two 10.8-inch, eight 5.5-inch, four 2.5-inch, besides 1.8-inch and 1.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(c) Masséna class (completed 1898), comprising *Masséna* and *Bouvet*; two 12-inch, two 10.8-inch, eight 5.5-inch, eight 3.9-inch, besides 1.8-inch and 1.4-inch guns; 17-8 knots.

(d) Charlemagne class (completed 1898-1900), comprising *Charlemagne, Saint Louis, Gaulois*; four 12-inch, ten 5.5-inch, eight 3.9-inch, sixteen 1.8-inch, and ten 1.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(e) *Henri IV* (completed 1902); two 10.8-inch, seven 5.5-inch, and twelve 1.8-inch guns; 17 knots.

(f) *Suffren* (completed 1903); four 12-inch, ten 6.4-inch, eight 3.9-inch, twenty 1.8-inch, and two 1.4-inch guns; 18 knots.

(g) République class (completed 1906), comprising *République* and *Patrie*;

four 12-inch, eighteen 6.4-inch, twenty-six 1.8-inch, and two 1.4-inch guns; 19 knots.

(h) *Démocratie* class (completed 1907), comprising *Démocratie*, *Vérité*, *Justice*; four 12-inch, ten 7.6-inch, twenty-six 1.8-inch, and two 1.4-inch guns; 19½ knots.

(i) *Diderot* class (completed 1911), comprising *Diderot*, *Danton*, *Condorcet*, *Vergniaud*, *Voltaire*, and *Mirabeau*; four 12-inch, twelve 9.4-inch, sixteen 12-pounder, eight 3-pounder, and two 1-pounder guns; 20 knots.

ARMoured CRUISERS: 19 in all.

(a) *Pothuau* (completed 1895); two 7.6-inch and ten 6.4-inch guns.

(b) *Jeanne d'Arc* (completed 1899); two 7.6-inch, fourteen 5.5-inch, sixteen 1.8-inch, and eight 1.4-inch guns; 21.7 knots.

(c) *Montcalm* class (completed 1902-5), comprising *Montcalm*, *Dupetit Thouars*, *Gueydon*; two 7.6-inch, eight 6.4-inch, four 3.9-inch, sixteen 1.8-inch, and six 1.4-inch guns; 21 knots.

(d) *Desaix* class (completed 1903-4), comprising *Desaix*, *Dupleix*, *Kléber*; eight 6.4-inch, four 3.9-inch, ten 1.8-inch, and four 1.4-inch guns; 21.7 knots.

(e) *Condé* class (completed 1903-4), comprising *Condé*, *Gloire*, *Amiral Aube*, *Marseillaise*; two 7.6-inch, eight 6.4-inch, six 3.9-inch, sixteen 1.8-inch, and six 1.4-inch guns; 21.4 knots.

(f) *Léon Gambetta* class (completed 1904-7), comprising *Léon Gambetta*, *Jules Ferry*, *Victor Hugo*; four 7.6-inch, sixteen 6.4-inch, twenty-two 1.8-inch, and two 1.4-inch guns; 23 knots.

(g) *Jules Michelet* class (completed 1908-9), comprising *Jules Michelet* and *Ernest Renan*; four 7.6-inch, twelve 6.4-inch, twenty-four 1.8-inch, and two 1.4-inch guns; 23 knots.

(h) *Edgar Quinet* class (completed 1911), comprising *Edgar Quinet* and *Waldeck Rousseau*; a kind of battle-cruiser; fourteen 7.6-inch, twenty 2.4-inch, and two smaller guns; 24 knots.

LIGHT PROTECTED CRUISERS: 10 in all, dating from 1895 to 1902.

OTHER VESSELS.

These include 87 Destroyers, dating from 1892 to 1914; 153 Torpedo Boats, dating from 1899 to 1907; 93 Submarines.

In consequence of the naval understanding established between Britain and France in recent years, particularly since the Morocco crisis of 1911, the French fleet was mainly concentrated in the Mediterranean at the opening of the war. The principal vessels of the French Mediterranean fleet are as follows:—

FIRST BATTLE SQUADRON. — *Courbet*, *Jean Bart*, *Condorcet*, *Danton*, *Diderot*, *Mirabeau*, *Vergniaud*, *Voltaire*.

SECOND BATTLE SQUADRON. — *Patrie*, *Démocratie*, *Justice*, *République*, *Vérité*.

RESERVE SHIPS: Battleships: *Bouvet*, *Gaulois*, *St. Louis*. Armoured Cruisers: *Waldeck Rousseau*, *Edgar Quinet*, *Ernest Renan*, *Jules Ferry*, *Léon Gambetta*, *Victor Hugo*.

THE RUSSIAN NAVY.—The war with Japan reduced the Russian fleet to insignificant proportions, but several modern ships have been

launched in recent years, and at the outbreak of war a large scheme of naval development was being planned. Russia has to keep two distinct fleets in Europe, one in the Baltic and one in the Black Sea, and she has also minor fleets in the Caspian Sea and on her Pacific coast. Her Baltic Fleet at the opening of the war was as follows:—

DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 4 in all.

Gangut, Pollava, Petropavlovsk, Sevastopol (launched in 1911); 23,000 tons; twelve 12-inch, sixteen 4.7-inch, and four 3-pounder guns; 23 knots.

DREADNOUGHT BATTLE-CRUISERS: 4 building.

Borodino, Ismail, Kinburn, Navarin; twelve 14-inch, twenty-one 5.1-inch, and four 3-pounder guns; 27 knots.

PRE-DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 4 in all.

Cesarevitch (completed 1903); four 12-inch, twelve 6-inch, twenty 3-inch, and six 1.4-inch guns; 19.6 knots.

Slava (completed 1905); four 12-inch, twelve 6-inch, and thirty-four 3-inch guns; 18 knots.

Imperator Pavel I and *Andrei Pervosvannyi* (completed 1910–11); four 12-inch, fourteen 8-inch, twelve 4.7-inch, and other guns; 18 knots.

ARMoured CRUISERS: 6 in all.

Rossia (1897) and *Gromoboi* (1900); 12,500 tons; four 8-inch, twenty-two 6-inch, twenty 3-inch, and smaller guns; 20 knots.

Admiral Makaroff (1908), *Pallada* (1910), and *Bayan* (1910), 7900 tons; two 8-inch, eight 6-inch, twenty 12-pounder, and four 6-pounder guns; 22.5 knots.

Rurik (1907), 15,000 tons; four 10-inch, eight 8-inch, and twenty 4.7 inch guns; 21 knots.

PROTECTED CRUISERS: 12 built and building.

Most of these have twelve or eight 6-inch guns, and some of them attain a speed of over 30 knots.

At the outbreak of war the Russian Black Sea Fleet was constituted entirely of pre-Dreadnoughts, but three Dreadnoughts were being built for it. The particulars were as follows:—

DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 3 building.

Ekaterina II, Imperatritsa Maria, and Alexander III; 22,500 tons; twelve 12-inch and twenty 5-inch guns; 21 knots.

PRE-DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 5 in all.

Sinope (1890); 10,000 tons; six 12-inch, seven 6-inch, and eight quick-firing guns; 16.75 knots.

Rostislav (1900); 8800 tons; four 10-inch, eight 6-inch, and sixteen small guns; 16 knots.

Panteleimon (1902); 12,500 tons; four 12-inch, sixteen 6-inch, fourteen 3-inch, and fourteen 1.4-inch guns.

Ivan Zlatoust (1910) and *Eustafi* (1911); 12,700 tons; four 12-inch, four 8-inch, twelve 6-inch, fourteen 3-inch, and other guns; 16 knots.

ARMoured CRUISERS: 2 completed and 2 building; 6-inch guns.

THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN NAVY.—The navy of the Dual Monarchy, though not large, is a very important factor in the Mediterranean. It is made up as follows:—

DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 4 built and building.

Viribus Unitis (completed 1913), *Tegetthoff* (1913), *Prins Eugen* (launched 1912), and *Szent Istvan* (launched 1914); 20,000 tons; twelve 12-inch, twelve 5.9-inch, and eighteen 12-pounder guns; 20.7 knots.

PRE-DREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS: 12 in all.

(a) Monarch class (completed 1896–7), comprising *Monarch*, *Wien*, *Buda-pest*; 5500 tons; four 9.4-inch, six 5.9-inch, and twelve 1.8-inch guns; 18 knots; for coast defence.

(b) Habsburg class (completed 1902–4), comprising, *Habsburg*, *Arpad*, *Babenberg*; 8200 tons; three 9.4-inch, twelve 5.9-inch, and ten 2.8-inch guns; 19.6 knots.

(c) Erzherzog (Archduke) class (completed 1905–7), comprising *Ershersog Karl*, *E. Friedrich*, and *E. Ferdinand Max*; 10,500 tons; four 9.4-inch, twelve 7.5-inch, twelve 2.8-inch, and six 1.8-inch guns; 20 knots.

(d) Radetzky class (completed 1910–1), comprising *Ershersog Frans Ferdinand*, *Radetsky*, *Zrinyi*; 14,200 tons; four 12-inch, eight 9.4-inch, twenty 3.9-inch, and six 12-pounder guns; 20 knots.

ARMoured CRUISERS: 3 in all.

One of these has 7.6-inch guns, and the other two have 9.4-inch guns as their heaviest armament.

PROTECTED CRUISERS: 9 built and building.

The newer types of these are armed with seven or nine 3.9-inch guns.

THE TURKISH NAVY.—At the outbreak of war Turkey had two Dreadnoughts building for her in Britain, but they were pre-empted by the British Government and re-named *Agincourt* and *Erin*. This left Turkey with three old battleships, as follows:—

Messudiyeh (built 1876 and renewed 1901); 9000 tons; two 9.2-inch, twelve 6-inch, fourteen 3-inch, and smaller guns; 17.5 knots.

Turgut Reis (1893), formerly German; 10,000 tons; six 11-inch, eight 4.1-inch, and eight 3.4-inch guns; 17 knots.

Khairredin Barbarossa (1894), formerly German; same as preceding.

She had also the two cruisers *Medjidieh* (1904) and *Hamidiyeh* (1904), with two 6-inch, eight 4.7-inch, and six 1.8-inch guns; besides smaller vessels.

NAVAL BASES AND DEFENCES.—The bases of the British navy in home waters are Portsmouth, Chatham, Devonport, and Rosyth, and use is also made of Cromarty and Scapa Flow, the latter practically an inland sea in the southern Orkneys. There are Government dock-yards at the first three places, and also at Pembroke. Harwich is the base for destroyers and submarines. The base of the German Fleet in the Baltic Sea is Kiel, and the North Sea base is Wilhelms-haven. Both of these places are fortified. Minor bases are Danzig and Sonderburg, on the Baltic coasts, and Cuxhaven, on the North

German Invasion of Luxemburg and Belgium 235

Sea coast, at the mouth of the Elbe. Cuxhaven and Danzig are fortified. Other coast fortified places are Geestemünde, near Bremerhaven; Swinemünde, on the Pomeranian coast; Heligoland, an island off the mouth of the Elbe; and Friedrichsort, near Kiel. The bases of the French navy are Cherbourg, on the English Channel; Brest, Lorient, and Rochefort, on the Atlantic; and Toulon, on the Mediterranean, the last-named being now the most important. All these bases are protected by forts. The Austro-Hungarian navy has its headquarters at Pola, on the coast of Dalmatia, with fortifications. Cattaro, on the same coast, is also fortified. The chief base of the Russian Baltic Fleet is Kronstadt, with strong fortifications; and other naval ports on this coast are Libau, Ust-Dvinsk (near Riga), Viborg, and Sveaborg. Sevastopol is the fortified headquarters of the Black Sea Fleet, and among other Black Sea coast towns more or less fortified are Nicolaiev, Kinburn, Ochakov, Kertch, Yenikale, Azov, Poti, and Batum.

TABLE SHOWING NAVAL STRENGTH OF THE PRINCIPAL
NAVAL POWERS

Countries.	Dreadnought Battleships and Battle-cruisers.	Pre-Dreadnought Battleships	Armoured Cruisers.	Other Cruisers	Destroyers	Modern Torpedo-Boats.	Sub-marines
Britain.....	44	40	34	96	238	70	96
France.	12	21	19	10	87	101	93
Russia.	11	9	10	12	140	25	43
Germany....	28	20	9	46	152	47	39
Austria-Hungary..	4	12	3	9	18	85	11
Turkey.....	0	3	0	2	—	—	—
Italy.....	10	8	10	11	46	75	20
Japan... ..	10	16	13	19	53	33	15
Greece.	1	3	1	1	14	7	2
United States.	14	25	15	13	66	21	50

The figures include ships building at the outbreak of war as well as those completed. Ships over twenty years old are mostly excluded. The battle-cruiser *Salamis* credited to Greece above was building in Stettin at the outbreak of the war. It would probably be pre-empted by Germany.

CHAPTER III

THE GERMAN INVASION OF LUXEMBURG AND BELGIUM

OPENING OF THE WAR.—The military story of the war may be regarded as beginning on 25 July, 1914, when the Tsar signed an order for the mobilization of the fourteen army corps belonging to the military districts of Odessa, Kiev, Moscow, and Kazan. This was a mobilization against Austria, and showed in a decisive way the determination of Russia to maintain the sovereign status of Serbia against the severe demands of Austria. The actual mobilization of these corps began on the 28th, the day when Austria declared war on Serbia and mobilized eight of her army corps, namely, those of Prague, Leit-

meritz, Graz, Budapest, Temesvár, Agram, Serajevo, and Ragusa. The Austrian mobilization at this stage was clearly anti-Serbian, because her Galician corps on the Russian frontiers were not affected. The Russian mobilization created alarm in Germany, especially when reports appeared in the French press that it included not merely anti-Austrian corps but also those of the districts of Warsaw, Vilna, and Petrograd, numbering thirteen in all, which were, of course, anti-German. About this time precautionary measures were being taken on both sides of the Franco-German frontier, but actual mobilization, involving the calling up of reserves, did not take place till later. Late in the evening of the 30th, Russia ordered a general mobilization of her whole army and navy, with the result that the war party in Berlin gained complete control of the situation and was able to achieve its purpose.

Germany declared *Kriegszustand*, or a state of war, on the afternoon of the 31st, thus preparing for mobilization, and late at night sent an ultimatum to Russia demanding demobilization within twelve hours. Next day, 1 August, Germany ordered a general mobilization, and late at night she declared war on Russia. Austria and France also ordered a general mobilization on this day. On the following day, 2 August, Sir Edward Grey gave to the French Ambassador, M. Paul Cambon, a memorandum containing a formal assurance from the Cabinet that, subject to the approval of Parliament, the British fleet would protect the French coasts and shipping against any attack from the German fleet by way of the Channel or the North Sea. This declaration virtually involved Britain in the war as the ally of France, but the British declaration of war against Germany took effect at 11 p.m. on 4 August, after Germany had finally refused to respect the neutrality of Belgium. On 2 August Germany asked Belgium to grant her a passage for her troops against France, and on Belgium's refusal she declared war against her on the 4th. On the 2nd, German troops crossed the Moselle into Luxemburg and took possession of the capital. Formal resistance was made by the Grand-Duchess and the Minister of State, but it was treated with contempt. The German declaration of war on France was made on the 3rd, when it had become clear that France was determined to support her Russian ally. Austria declared war on Russia on the 5th, in consequence of her alliance with Germany, after the dispute between them had been nearly adjusted. On 7 August, Montenegro, as the ally of Serbia, declared war on Austria. France broke off relations with Austria on 10 August, and Britain followed her example on 12 August. The immense magnitude of the conflict was now declared, although still other countries were to be involved before its close.

GERMAN STRATEGY AGAINST FRANCE.—German military experts had long worked out the strategy of a war on two fronts against France and Russia, but it is doubtful whether they were prepared for war at the same time on a third front, against the naval power of Britain. They regarded the offensive as the best method of defence, and sought so to handle the campaign as to keep the fighting off German soil.

German Invasion of Luxemburg and Belgium 237



Russian mobilization, although speeded up in recent years, was much slower than German and French mobilization, and Germany was believed to be able to mobilize a little faster than France. The policy of the German staff was to hold the Russian frontier with second-line troops at the outset, while a swift, crushing blow was delivered at the heart of France. Then, when France had been dealt with and possibly detached from the Russian alliance, a strong attack would be delivered against Russia before she was completely ready. An effective invasion of the heart of Russia was not contemplated, because of its immense difficulty, but Warsaw might be captured and the line of the Vistula held against all counter-attacks. The rôle of Austria in the campaign was to advance from Galicia into Russian Poland from the south from the very beginning of the war, thus threatening Russia's hold on Poland and hampering her mobilization. Paris was the objective of the first swift westward advance, Warsaw of the later eastward advance. In carrying out such a plan Germany enjoyed the great advantage of operating on interior lines and being able, by means of her excellent railway system, to move troops and munitions rapidly from one front to the other.

German strategists had long ago come to the conclusion that the swift blow at France required by the plan thus outlined could only be delivered across Belgium and Luxemburg, and this fact was well known to military students in France, Belgium, Britain, and other countries. Serious political and moral objections could be urged against the violation of Belgian and Luxemburg neutrality, but to a strategist, engaged in what he considers a matter of life and death, military necessity is apt to be the only law. The Franco-German frontier, of some 240 miles, was very strongly guarded on the French side by the four great fortresses of Belfort, Épinal, Toul, and Verdun. A chain of forts connected the first two, and another chain the last two, while between Épinal and Toul there was the defensible line of the Moselle. To give room for the deployment of huge modern armies these fortresses would have to be all reduced, a task which was regarded as too great for the limited time available on the swift-blow theory. The actual experience of the war proves that the odium of violating Belgium and Luxemburg was incurred without the expected advantage and without real military necessity, since Paris was not reached, largely owing to the delay due to Belgian resistance, and since even the strongest modern fortresses have been shown to be easily enough reduced by modern siege howitzers. If Germany had decided not to attempt a direct attack on the fortress-line, and at the same time to respect the neutral states, she would have had to move all her armies through the narrow defile between Metz and Luxemburg, passing north of Verdun to the valley of the Aisne. This would have been a perilous course, and she would have had only one line of rail for her huge supplies and troop movements. Therefore, having resolved neither to stand on the defensive nor to attack the fortress barrier, she chose to deploy her armies through Luxemburg and Belgium.

THE INVASION OF LUXEMBURG.—Germany has a common frontier with Luxemburg of about 110 miles, 25 miles of which are formed by the River Moselle. Her common frontier with Belgium is about 70 miles long. Her first violation of neutral territory affected Luxemburg, because it was essential to her plan of campaign against France to seize the way to the central Meuse valley that leads from the town of Luxemburg by Arlon along the course of the River Semois in the southern Ardennes. Luxemburg is a Grand-Duchy neutralized since 1867 under the guarantee of the Great Powers, and the fortifications of the capital, formerly one of the strongest fortresses of Europe, were demolished after that year. Its area is barely 1000 square miles, about the size of the county of Durham, and its population is little more than a quarter of a million. The people are of German race and speech, and nearly all Roman Catholic. Luxemburg, the capital, with about 20,000 inhabitants, is picturesquely situated on the heights above the little river Alzette and a tributary, and in the narrow ravine between the precipitous cliffs. On Sunday, 2 August, a small body of troops entered Luxemburg from Diedenhofen (Thionville), in the south, and seized the Adolf Bridge leading into the capital. The young Grand-Duchess Marie Adelaide drew up her motor-car across their route by way of formal protest, and the Minister of State, M. Eyschen, did likewise, but armed resistance was out of the question, and the Germans promised compensation for any damage done. Larger bodies of troops followed from Trèves up the Moselle, and crossed into the Grand-Duchy by the bridges across the river at Wasserbillig and Remich. The occupation of Luxemburg was peacefully completed in a few hours.

THE CAPTURE OF LIÉGE.—It was otherwise with the invasion of Belgium. The Belgians had long prepared for defence against any attempted use of their country as a military right-of-way, and there had been military conversations for several years with Britain and France on this question. When the crucial moment came she resolved on armed resistance in vindication of her neutrality. Her army, which was undergoing a process of reorganization, was hurriedly mobilized, and steps were taken to man her fortresses, especially Liège, which would have to stand the first fury of the German attack. Germany made use of three ways into Belgium. There was the route from the German frontier town of Malmedy by Stavelot along the northern slopes of the Ardennes to Dinant, Namur, and Huy; and there were the two routes from Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen), one by the railway line to Liège down the valley of the Vesdre, and the other by road to the narrow, unprotected gap between the northernmost of the Liège forts and the Dutch frontier, where were situated the villages of Visé and Argenteau on the Meuse. This defile from Liège to Visé had to be seized at all costs before the great sweep through Belgium could begin.

The ancient city of Liège, well known in modern times as a centre of the Belgian Black Country, is situated on both banks of the River Meuse at its junction with the Ourthe and the Vesdre. The river here



PLANS SHOWING FORTIFICATIONS OF LIÈGE AND NAMUR

flows between the hilly, wooded country of the Ardennes on the right bank and the plateau of central Belgium on the left bank. The railway from Liège to Brussels has to climb steeply up, on an embankment called the *Plan Incliné*, within a few miles to the junction of Ans, nearly 500 feet above Liège, but after that the way to the capital lies across a broad plain. The right bank of the river is also steep, and both slopes are clothed with wood and scrub. The principal part of the city is situated on the left bank. The fortifications of the town were constructed according to the plans of the famous Belgian military engineer Brialmont, in 1888-92, and were regarded as among the finest works of their kind. The old citadel was no longer of any use for defence, but twelve forts formed a ring of about 4 miles radius round the town. The total circumference of the ring was about 33 miles, and the distances between the forts varied from about 2 to over 4 miles. The intervals were supposed to be held by an adequate force of entrenched infantry protected by entanglements. The forts were of two classes, six of them large and pentagonal, and six of them smaller and triangular. All of them consisted of works under the ground, protected by concrete masonry, and the guns were placed in steel cupolas, which could be raised into firing position and lowered at will. The guns consisted of 6-inch and 4.7-inch pieces, with 8-inch mortars and light quick-firers, the total number being about 400. The most northerly fort was Pontisse, on the left bank of the Meuse, and on the east were the forts of Barchon and Fléron, with the smaller fort or *fortin* of Évegnée between them. The line of the Vesdre was guarded by the *fortins* of Chaudfontaine and Embourg, and in the south, west of the Ourthe, stood the fort of Boncelles. The western forts were Flémalle and Loncin, the former near the Meuse, with Hologne as a *fortin* between them, and the *fortins* of Lantin and Liers between Loncin and Pontisse. (See accompanying map.)

When the German attack became imminent, the Liège forts were hastily provisioned and manned, and some troops were rushed into the town to guard the intervals between the eastern forts. The Civic Guard was also summoned out for duty, but the total force defending the town could not much exceed 20,000. The German attack on the town was at first made by a scratch force of three Divisions on a peace footing from the VIIth, IXth, and Xth Corps, with headquarters at Münster, Altona, and Hanover respectively. This force, less than 35,000 in all, not fully equipped for campaigning, and without an adequate siege-train to reduce the forts, was commanded by General von Emmich, commander of the Xth Army Corps. The Germans evidently expected trifling opposition at Liège and suffered severely for their miscalculation, but the final result was never for a moment in any real doubt. Liège delayed the advance much more than the Germans expected, and thereby gave the French and British time to complete their mobilization and get their field-armies in position to stay the onslaught, but, as events were to show, the delay was not long enough to enable the Allies to keep the campaign out of French territory.

The attack began with an artillery duel on the night of 4 August, but the Germans had no guns with them adequate to reduce the forts. On the 5th a determined German infantry attack in massed formation was repulsed with great loss by the Belgians, and the defenders were naturally elated with their initial success. The hopes founded on this minor victory were soon dashed, for the small Belgian force was unable to hold the intervals against increasing German forces extending over the whole front, and the forts were quickly silenced one by one when the enemy brought up their 8.2-inch and 11-inch siege howitzers. Fléron was put out of action on the 6th, and Chaudfontaine fell the same day. A body of Hussars dashed into the city and attempted by a ruse to capture General Leman, the Belgian commander in Liège, but Leman evaded them, and was able to conduct the defence to the very end. Évegnée and Barchon, the other eastern forts, were soon reduced, and then the town was completely exposed, although the northern and western forts still held out. Leman withdrew the troops and sent them back to join the Belgian field-army on the River Dyle, with Louvain as headquarters, and after two bombardments had been begun the town was surrendered to the Germans on 7 August. On the previous day the Germans, because of their heavy losses in the fighting, had asked for an armistice to bury their dead, but the Belgians refused to grant it. Comparatively little damage had been done to the town, and the German occupation appears to have been orderly, although the requisitions were heavy. The retreat of the Belgian forces from the town must have been very hurried or badly managed, for considerable stores were left behind, and of the twelve bridges across the Meuse only one, the Pont des Arches, was destroyed and another damaged, but not beyond repair. The great railway bridge of Val Benoît, that carries the railway from Liège to Cologne, was left intact.

Having occupied the town, the Germans on 9 August made a fresh attempt, this time through the Dutch Government, to come to terms with Belgium. She repeated her former assertion that her advance through Belgium was necessitated by French plans that had come to her knowledge, and she prayed Belgium to avoid further horrors of war by conceding an unopposed passage. Three days later Belgium repeated her refusal of this proposal to compromise her neutrality, thereby electing to take all the risks of a national martyrdom in the cause of the Allies.

So long as the forts west of the Meuse still held out, the occupation of Liège could not yield the desired access to the Belgian plain. Fort Loncin, in which General Leman had shut himself up, commanded the important railway junction of Ans. Their fall, however, was only a matter of time. Embourg fell on the 13th, Boncelles soon afterwards, and by the 15th all the forts were reduced. Leman was taken prisoner in an unconscious state in Loncin, and General von Emmich, in recognition of his gallant defence, bade him keep his sword. It was on the 7th, the day when the Germans occupied the city, that President Poincaré conferred upon Liège the well-deserved Legion of Honour.



Photo Russell

GENERAL SIR DOUGLAS HAIG, K.C.B.

Commander of the First British Army



Photo Russell

GENERAL SIR HORACE SMITH-DORRIEN, G.C.B.

Commander of the Second British Army



GENERAL LEMAN

Defender of Liège



GENERAL VON EMMICH

German Commander against Liège

German Invasion of Luxemburg and Belgium 241

THE ADVANCE ON BRUSSELS.—Even before the attack on Liège the Germans attempted to cross the Meuse at Visé, but the bridge there had been destroyed by the Belgians as a defensive precaution, and Belgian troops were in position to prevent the Germans from crossing the river. The Germans constructed pontoon bridges, but these were destroyed by Belgian fire before they could be used. Ultimately, however, the enemy succeeded in bridging the Meuse, and the 2nd Cavalry Division crossed to take part in the preliminary scouting and screening operations on the Belgian plain. In the course of the artillery attacks the town of Visé suffered severely from outbreaks of fire, and the neighbouring village of Argenteau was also largely destroyed.

The troops with which Von Emmich took Liège were part of the First German Army of the West. This army consisted of the VIIth, IXth, and Xth Army Corps, with additional cavalry, and was under the command of General von Kluck, Inspector-General of the Eighth Army Inspection. The Second Army, comprising the IIIrd, XIth, and Guards Corps, with additional cavalry, was commanded by General von Bülow, Inspector-General of the Third Inspection. These two armies, numbering altogether little if any less than 400,000 men, were set apart for the great enveloping movement through Belgium. Von Bülow, advancing by Malmedy and Stavelot, across the northern Ardennes, seized the town of Huy, on the Meuse, on 12 August, and spread his forces along the southern bank of the river. Huy was supposed to have some fortifications, but these were evidently of no value.

The main German advance against the Belgian field-army could not begin until the northern Liège forts had fallen, that is, about 15 August; but light Uhlan cavalry, assisted by other arms, fought various outpost actions with the Belgians even before that date. The German forces in these minor affairs were never large, and the Belgians usually gained the victory; but the impression of German military weakness given by them was a false one and was quickly dispelled when the main armies of Von Kluck and Von Bülow, or portions of them, pressed forward to Brussels. Brussels was not on the main line of advance to France, but it was necessary to put the Belgian field-army out of action or shut it up in Antwerp before the invasion of France could be safely undertaken. This field-army was about 100,000 strong, and was under the supreme command of General Selières de Moranville. It held the line of the River Dyle, with Louvain as its headquarters.

The Germans tried to turn the Belgian left flank in order to cut off the retreat of the Belgian army down the Dyle by Malines to Antwerp. On 12 August they made an attempt to cross the River Gethe, a tributary of the Dyle, at Haelen, near Diest, but the Belgians were in sufficient force there to drive them back from the bridges and rout them in a cavalry charge. The Germans, however, succeeded later in the same day in crossing the River Gethe at another point, but after a stubborn fight they were foiled in their attempt to seize the bridge across the Velp, a tributary of the Gethe, at Cortenaeken. These

successes secured the Belgian left flank for the time being. Next day, 13 August, the Belgians repulsed an attack at Tirlemont, in the centre of their position, and at Eghezee, on their extreme right, not far from Namur, they drove out a body of German cavalry by a surprise attack, after inflicting considerable loss upon them. With the fall of Fort Loncin, the last of the Liège forts to hold out, the way was clear for the irresistible onrush of the German hosts, and, in the absence of effective French and British support, the fate of Belgium was sealed for the time. Ever since the beginning of the German invasion the Belgians had been looking eagerly but in vain for the coming of the French and British. It is true that a French force came along the Sambre on 14 August, but it was too small to have any material effect, and Belgium had to prepare for the last extremities of national suffering while her allies were preparing to make their stand.

When the main German advance began about the middle of August, the Belgian army had to fall back step by step, fighting only rearguard actions. There was such an action at Aerschot on the 14th, another at Wavre on the 16th, and on the 18th Tirlemont fell to the Germans. It had originally been intended to defend Brussels, although unfortified, and the surroundings of the city had been put in a state of defence with trenches and entanglements. Fortunately the Government changed its mind, partly because the Germans refused to recognize the Civic Guard as regular combatants, and it was decided to save the city from damage by surrendering it without opposition, while the field-army, led by the brave and popular King Albert, retired within the fortified lines of Antwerp. The Government was withdrawn to Antwerp on the 17th, and on the 20th Brussels surrendered unconditionally to the German army. M. Max, the Burgomaster, bore himself with great firmness and dignity throughout the trying ordeal and throughout the subsequent occupation, until at length his firm, patriotic attitude caused the Germans to send him to a fortress in Germany. German troops were to march through the town, and a certain number were to be quartered in it, but property would be respected, the municipal administration would continue under military control, and goods requisitioned would be paid for. A levy of £8,000,000 was imposed upon the town. The troops who marched into the town on 20 August, to the number of about 40,000, were not drawn from the units that had been engaged in the fighting, but from regiments still fresh and untarnished. The German military governor was General Sixtus von Arnim, commander of the IVth Army Corps.




Photo R. Haines

ADMIRAL LORD FISHER, G.C.B., O.M.

First Sea Lord of the Admiralty



Photo Russell

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN R. JELlicoe, K.C.B.

Commander-in-Chief of the British Grand Fleet



Photo Speaight, Ltd.

ADMIRAL SIR DAVID BEATTY, K.C.B.

Commanding the British First Fleet



ADMIRAL ALFRED VON TIRPITZ

Commanding the German High Seas Fleet

CHAPTER IV

THE OPENING OF THE NAVAL WAR

THE BRITISH FLEET MOBILIZED.—It had been decided long before a European war was in sight to substitute for Grand Manœuvres in 1914 a test mobilization of the Third Fleet, involving the calling up of the whole of the Royal Fleet Reserve for eleven days. This was carried out with great success, and on 18–20 July the King passed in review at Spithead a mighty assemblage of about 200 ships of war, constituting the most imposing display of naval power the world had ever seen. Even at the time of the review the European storm-clouds were gathering, although Britons were more interested in the Irish crisis, and before many days had elapsed the Admiralty took precautionary measures. On the morning of 27 July, the day before the Austrian declaration of war and the Russian partial mobilization, it was announced that orders had been given to the First Fleet, which was concentrated at Portland, not to disperse for manœuvre leave, and that all vessels of the Second Fleet were remaining at their home ports in proximity to their balance crews. Two days later the First Fleet left Portland Roads under Sir George A. Callaghan, who had been Commander-in-Chief of the Home Fleets since 1911. The decision to mobilize the Fleet was taken by Mr. Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, on Sunday, 2 August, the day following Germany's declaration of war against Russia, and on Monday, 4 August, the Admiralty was able to announce that the mobilization had been completed in all respects by four o'clock that morning. On that day it was also announced that Sir John R. Jellicoe had been appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Home Fleets in succession to Sir George Callaghan, whose retirement was due in the ordinary course in a few months.

The First Sea Lord of the Admiralty at this time was Prince Louis of Battenberg, an Admiral of great experience and capacity, who enjoyed the full confidence of the service, but the nationality of his birth made his position a difficult one at such a crisis, and on 30 October he resigned. His place was filled by the recall of Lord Fisher of Kilverstone, the maker of the present British navy, to his old post. Mr. Churchill was fully justified in his assertion that the war found the British navy as well prepared as it found the German army.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH NAVY.—The British navy has performed a triple service during the war. In the first place, it has been a combatant force, serving as "the sure shield of Britain", attacking the enemy's naval ships whenever opportunity has offered, and destroying or disabling them as far as possible. In the second place, it has stopped the overseas trade of Germany, thus enormously reducing her economic resources and her sources of supply of war munitions, while at the same time enabling British merchantmen to come and go very much as usual. In the third place, it has co-operated directly with the land forces, especially in Europe, by protecting the transport of

British troops to France and by operations against the German positions on the Belgian coast. The first kind of work has always been regarded popularly as the chief work of the navy, but the conditions of modern naval warfare have made it much more difficult and much less spectacular than in previous naval wars. On its purely defensive side there has never been any anxiety, because British supremacy in the home seas was beyond all challenge at the outbreak of war. The landing of any considerable German force has been hardly a conceivable possibility, and the flying raids on the east coast of England only served to emphasize the security of the British islands behind their shield. The submarine and the mine, however, have made attack very dangerous for large ships of war, and compel ceaseless vigilance to avoid disaster. The German High Sea Fleet has not come out from its North Sea bases to offer battle, because of its inferiority in numbers and gun-power, but Germany has mined both her own coasts and the strategic areas off the British coasts, especially along the possible routes of transports, and her submarines have shown abundant dash and activity. She has met with some success in this policy, but the hoped-for attrition of the British fleet has not been accomplished. There has been attrition on both sides, and Britain's relative superiority has become greater than ever, but the decisive capital engagement for which Britons hoped at the outset did not come about, because mine, submarine, and fort have together made a strong defence for the German North Sea coasts.

In the war on commerce British success has been decisive. Many German vessels were seized in the ports of the Empire at the outbreak of war, but against these must be set nearly as many British ships seized in German ports at the same time. For a time a number of German cruisers and armed liners preyed on British commercial shipping, but one by one these were destroyed or interned, and within six months of the opening of the war this danger was entirely removed. From the very outset not a German merchant-ship could sail, and all German supplies from overseas had to come in neutral vessels, subject to the strict enforcement of contraband regulations as interpreted by the British Admiralty. At the same time Britain was free to bring troops from all parts of her empire to the central seat of war in Europe. From this point of view the success of the navy was complete and almost instantaneous.

In the Baltic the German fleet was master because of the weakness of Russia in large modern ships. The entrances to the Baltic from the north were guarded by mines, partly German and partly Danish, and therefore Britain could do nothing on the eastern side of Schleswig. In the Mediterranean the French fleet under Admiral Boué de Lapeyrère, reinforced by large British ships, was much more than a match for the small Austrian fleet, which was kept shut up in its bases. The transport of French African troops from Algiers, as well as of British troops from the overseas Empire, could therefore be effected in perfect safety.

EARLY NAVAL INCIDENTS.—The first important naval engagement

of the war took place on 28 August, but in the few weeks preceding that date several minor naval events worthy of notice fall to be recorded.

On Sunday, 2 August, the German light cruiser *Augsburg* opened the naval war by bombarding the Russian naval port of Libau, on the Baltic coast, but no particular damage seems to have been done. Three hours after the expiry of the British ultimatum to Germany, that is to say, early on the morning of 5 August, two British submarines, E6 and E8, made a pioneer reconnaissance in the Heligoland Bight. This was only the beginning of a constant process of submarine reconnaissance along the enemy's coast requiring great skill and daring. According to the report of Commodore Roger J. B. Keyes, C.B., M.V.O., dated 17 October, 1914, the submarines "have occupied his [the enemy's] waters and reconnoitred his anchorages, and, while so engaged, have been subjected to skilful and well-executed anti-submarine tactics; hunted for hours at a time by torpedo craft and attacked by gunfire and torpedoes".

At noon on 5 August the Third Torpedo Flotilla, headed by the light cruiser *Amphion*, sank the *Königin Luise* off the coast of Essex, not far from Harwich. The *Königin Luise* was a Hamburg-Amerika liner fitted out for mine-laying, and was evidently engaged in sowing mines along the route that would be followed by transports carrying troops from Harwich to Belgium, or possibly trying to seal up Harwich, which was a base for scouting submarines and destroyers. The destroyer *Lance* seems to have sunk the German ship with four shots. There were no British casualties. A number of Germans were saved from the sinking ship. While reconnoitring next morning, after this success, the *Amphion* was unfortunate enough to strike one of the mines that had been laid by the German ship. Her forepart was shattered by the explosion, and over 100 of her men were killed, in addition to a number of German prisoners. The remaining 152 officers and men, including Captain Fox, were saved by destroyers' boats before the doomed ship went down. This early loss prepared the British people for other similar disasters entailed by the new naval warfare, some of them very much more serious in the loss of life involved.

On 9 August a number of German submarines made an attack on one of the Cruiser Squadrons of the Grand Fleet in the North Sea. The attack failed completely, and one of the enemy submarines, U15, was sunk by the light cruiser *Birmingham*. A small Austrian torpedo cruiser, the *Zenta*, was sunk by the French off Antivari, in the Mediterranean on 16 August, and two days later an Austrian torpedo-boat was blown up by a mine off the naval harbour of Pola, in the Adriatic. On 27 August the German light cruiser *Magdeburg* ran ashore in a fog on the small island of Odensholm, at the entrance of the Gulf of Finland. She was subjected to heavy fire from a number of Russian ships, and her captain caused her to be blown up. The majority of her crew are said to have been saved by a torpedo-boat and taken to Germany. On the same day Germany lost one of her armed merchant cruisers which had

been sent out to prey on British commerce in the Atlantic. This ship, the *Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse*, was a North German Lloyd steamer of 14,000 tons, and had in her day wrested the Atlantic speed record from the Cunard Line. Before she met her doom she gained some successes, her chief captures being the New Zealand Shipping Company's *Kaipara* and the Elder-Dempster ship *Nyanza*. These were sunk after the crews had been taken prisoner, but in the case of the Union-Castle liner *Galician* she was content to destroy her papers and take two army officers as prisoners. On 27 August she was completing her coaling from colliers off the Moroccan coast when H.M.S. *Highflyer*, a British light cruiser, discovered her. Having transferred her prisoners to the colliers, she made a fight against the *Highflyer*, but her 4-inch guns were outmatched by the 6-inch guns of her foe, and she was soon sunk. The British loss was only one killed and five slightly wounded. The *Kaiser Wilhelm's* officers treated their prisoners with great courtesy and humanity, in pleasant contrast to some deplorable actions that were to take place later when feeling became more embittered. The movements of the *Goeben* and *Breslau* in the Mediterranean will be described when we come to treat of Turkey's intervention in the war.


THE BATTLE OF HELIGOLAND.—The first considerable naval battle of the war took place close to Heligoland on 28 August, but the main fighting was done by light cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. Of the Dreadnoughts, only one British battle-cruiser had any fighting share in it. The action was not a chance engagement, but a carefully planned operation, and it was carried out with great skill, daring, and resource, and with substantial success. At midnight on 26 August, Commodore Roger J. B. Keyes sailed from Harwich with the Eighth Submarine Flotilla, comprising D 2, D 8, E 4, E 5, E 6, E 7, E 8, and E 9, accompanied by the destroyers *Lurcher* and *Firedrake*, to prepare the way for the larger vessels. The two destroyers scouted for the submarines until nightfall on the 27th. At five o'clock on the morning of that day the First and Third Destroyer Flotillas, under the command of Commodore Reginald Y. Tyrwhitt, with the new light cruiser *Arethusa* as flagship, sailed from Harwich towards Heligoland to take up their prearranged positions. The light cruiser *Fearless* joined these flotillas at sea during that afternoon. On that day also the First Battle-cruiser Squadron, under Vice-Admiral Sir David Beatty, the First Light-cruiser Squadron, under Commodore William E. Goodenough, and the Seventh Cruiser Squadron, under Rear-Admiral H. H. Campbell, also put to sea, in order to be ready to fulfil their allotted parts in the Admiralty's plan. Rear-Admiral A. H. Christian was in general command of the Seventh Cruiser Squadron, the Destroyer Flotillas, and the Submarine Flotilla. Sir David Beatty's force consisted of the *Lion* (flagship), *Princess Royal*, and *Queen Mary*, and he was joined by the *Invincible* (under Rear-Admiral Sir A. G. Moore), *New Zealand*, and the four destroyers *Hornet*, *Hydra*, *Tigress*, and *Loyal*, the work of the destroyers being



H.M.S. *LION*

Photo Cribb

Flagship of the British First Battle-cruiser Squadron



GERMAN LIGHT CRUISER *MAINZ*

Sunk in the Battle of Heligoland, August 28, 1914

to guard against submarines. Commodore Goodenough's squadron comprised the *Southampton* (flagship), *Falmouth*, *Birmingham*, *Lowestoft*, and *Nottingham*; and Admiral Campbell's squadron consisted of the *Euryalus* (Admiral Christian's flagship), *Cressy*, *Hogue*, *Aboukir*, *Sutlej*, *Bacchante*, and *Amethyst*, the last a light cruiser.

At daybreak on the day appointed for the action, 28 August, the *Lurcher* and *Firedrake* searched the area that would be traversed by the battle-cruisers for enemy submarines, and then sailed towards Heligoland in the wake of the submarines E6, E7, and E8 to draw the enemy out in pursuit. The atmosphere was rather misty, reducing visibility to about 3 miles, which may have rendered it impossible to make use of the guns on the Heligoland forts. The calmness of the sea was unfavourable for the most effective submarine work. A number of German destroyers and two German cruisers, the *Ariadne*, and another supposed to be the *Yorck* or the *Strassburg*, came out from behind Heligoland, and were enticed westwards to where Tyrwhitt's Destroyer Flotillas were bearing down on them from the north-west. This was about 7 a.m. The German ships were headed off from retreat, and an engagement ensued, destroyer with destroyer, and cruiser with cruiser. The *Arethusa* was heavily engaged with both cruisers and several destroyers for a time, but the *Fearless* later drew the fire of the second cruiser. The *Arethusa* succeeded in destroying the fore-bridge of the *Ariadne* about a quarter past eight, after which the German ship gave up the contest and drew off, followed by her companion. The *Arethusa* was severely damaged, all her guns but one being out of action, but she was quickly repaired. The German destroyer V187 was sunk, and several others were considerably damaged. The British ships sailed away to the west after this preliminary victory.

At ten o'clock Commodore Tyrwhitt, with *Arethusa*, *Fearless*, and the First Destroyer Flotilla, went to the help of the *Lurcher* and *Firedrake*, which were reported chased by light cruisers, but when they got very near Heligoland without receiving news they turned back westward. About eleven o'clock the *Arethusa*, aided by the *Fearless* and the First Flotilla, became heavily engaged with a four-funnelled German cruiser, probably either the *Yorck* or the *Strassburg*, and the position became so critical that Tyrwhitt sent wireless signals to Admiral Beatty for help. Admiral Beatty, whose Battle-cruiser Squadron had to evade submarine attack by rapid manoeuvring and destroyer counter-attack, sent the Light-cruiser Squadron to Tyrwhitt's support, but before it arrived the German cruisers had retired damaged. The arrival of the Light-cruiser Squadron found the *Arethusa* and her companions victorious over another enemy cruiser, the *Mainz*, which was on fire and sinking by the head. The *Arethusa* then engaged the cruiser *Köln* at long range, without visible effect.

Beatty made up his mind to reinforce the hard-pressed cruisers and destroyers in overwhelming strength, and at half-past eleven the Battle-cruiser Squadron steamed east-south-east at full speed. Its

arrival found the Light-cruiser Squadron finishing off the *Mainz*, and the *Arethusa* exchanging broadsides with the *Köln*. The battle-cruisers steered to cut the *Köln* off from Heligoland, and shortly after half-past twelve the *Lion* opened fire on her. The enemy then turned north-east chased by the battle-cruisers, which soon came across the cruiser *Ariadne*. Two salvoes from the *Lion* took decisive effect on her, and she disappeared into the mist, burning furiously and in a sinking condition. The presence of floating mines made further pursuit inadvisable, and accordingly the battle-cruisers turned north to finish the *Köln*, which was sunk at 1.35 p.m. by two salvoes from the *Lion*. The *Queen Mary* soon afterwards evaded a submarine by the use of her helm, and the cruiser *Lowestoft* was also unsuccessfully attacked. The fight was now over, and the battle-cruisers covered the westward retirement of the British ships until nightfall. At half-past four Admiral Christian's squadron fell in with the *Lurcher* and other three destroyers. The wounded and prisoners on board these vessels were transferred to the *Bacchante* and *Cressy*, which left for the Thames. The damaged destroyer *Laurel* was taken in tow by the *Amethyst*, and the *Arethusa* by the *Hogue*.

The Germans lost two modern light cruisers, the *Mainz* and the *Köln*, an older cruiser, the *Ariadne*, and one destroyer, V 187, besides having another cruiser, the *Yorck* or the *Strassburg*, and several destroyers badly damaged. All on board the *Köln* went down, but many of those on board the other sunk ships were saved by the merciful daring of the British sailors. It is said that German ships attacked our men when engaged in rescuing the crew of the sunk destroyer, but this was probably due to misunderstanding. The German loss in lives was not less than 700, and some 300 prisoners fell into British hands. Among the prisoners was Lieutenant Tirpitz, of the *Mainz*, son of Admiral von Tirpitz, the organizer of the German navy. No British ship was sunk, but several suffered damage, namely, the *Arethusa* and the *Fearless*, which had borne the brunt of the action, and the destroyers *Laertes*, *Laurel*, and *Liberty*, all of the Third Flotilla. The British casualties were 69 killed and wounded, chiefly on the *Arethusa* and the *Laurel*.

CHAPTER V


THE GERMAN INVASION OF FRANCE

FRENCH AND BRITISH MILITARY PREPARATIONS.—As we have already stated, the mobilization of the French army was begun on 1 August. At first there were signs of unreadiness, and even to some extent of incapacity, but it very quickly attained a standard of efficiency that reflected immense credit upon its organizers and leaders. A Ministry of National Defence was constituted, M. Viviani, the ex-



GENERAL JOFFRE

From a photograph by Henri Manuel



FIELD-MARSHAL SIR JOHN D. P. FRENCH,
G.C.B.

From a photograph by Reginald Haines



GRAND-DUKE NICHOLAS

From a photograph



ALBERT, KING OF THE BELGIANS

From a photograph by Boute, Brussels

Socialist, remaining Premier, and room being made for all kinds of Republicans, including even such noted Socialists as M. Guesde and M. Sembat. M. Millerand, an ex-Socialist, was recalled to the War Office, and speedily justified his appointment. The supreme command of the French armies passed, in virtue of his office as Chief of the General Staff, to General Césaire Joffre, who was to prove himself a strategist of the first order. General Joffre was one of M. Millerand's discoveries, and like Lord Kitchener in Britain kept himself entirely out of politics.

Britain began the mobilization of her army on 4 August, when the time limit of her ultimatum to Germany was running out. This mobilization involved the calling up of all reservists to the colours, so as to put the Regular Army at full war strength, and the embodiment of the Territorials. On 5 August, Lord Kitchener, whose return to Egypt as Consul-General had been stopped the previous week owing to the threatening nature of the crisis, was appointed to the Cabinet as Secretary for War in place of Mr. Asquith, who had assumed the duties of the office in a special emergency arising out of the Irish Home Rule controversy. This was a bold and unprecedented step, entirely different from what happened at the Admiralty and at the French War Office, but it was generally approved by the country as justified by special circumstances. It was soon decided to send to the Continent at the earliest possible moment the Expeditionary Force for which Lord Haldane's great army reforms had provided, and to the work of organizing it Lord Kitchener brought his great abilities. The railways were taken under the control of the Government, the management being unified under an executive committee of general managers, and many merchant vessels were commandeered as transports. Motor vehicles were commandeered on a large scale, especially those for which subsidies had been granted in peace time, and an immense number of horses were acquired for the cavalry and artillery. Among motor vehicles taken were London omnibuses and many commercial wagons, which were shipped to the front with their signs unchanged. The machinery worked so smoothly and rapidly, in accordance with long-prepared plans, that the dispatch of troops to France began a few days after mobilization had been proclaimed, and by 16 August two Army Corps, a Cavalry Division, and an extra Cavalry Brigade, in all about 100,000 men, were on French soil. The transports had sailed from several British and Irish ports, notably Southampton, and had landed troops at several French ports, chiefly Boulogne and Havre. The Commander-in-Chief of the British force was Field-Marshal Sir John D. P. French, who had been Chief of the Imperial General Staff. The two Army Corps were commanded by Sir Douglas Haig and Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien respectively, and the Cavalry Division by Major-General E. H. H. Allenby. The Second Army Corps was to have been under the command of Sir James Grierson, but unfortunately he died of heart failure soon after landing in France, before he had taken up his duties. The transport of this force, with all

its equipment, was a fine feat of organization, rendered possible only by the complete mastery of the seas, which the navy had already secured without a blow. There was no covering fleet, but the destroyers *Lurcher* and *Firedrake* and the submarines of the Eighth Flotilla occupied positions from which they could have attacked the German High Sea Fleet had it emerged to dispute the passage of the transports. Airships and aeroplanes of the naval service also flew over the routes of passage, keeping a sharp look-out for enemy vessels. The communications between the British forces on the Continent and their island base were to be kept secure throughout the war by the Fleet's mastery of the seas and the unceasing vigilance of submarines, destroyers, and aircraft.

It soon became apparent that Britain, once committed to military intervention in the war on the Continent, could not rest content with the transport of the Expeditionary Force contemplated in time of peace. The military commitments required by our foreign policy needed an army far larger than our military system provided for, and it was doubtless their secret character that had prevented the Government from harmonizing its military with its foreign policy. Lord Kitchener, however, faced the situation boldly. On 6 August the House of Commons unanimously granted a vote of credit for £100,000,000, and authorized the increase of the army by 500,000 men. This number was increased by a later vote to 1,000,000, and by a still later vote to 2,000,000 men, and the money vote was also enormously increased. Recruiting campaigns were carried on throughout the whole country, largely by the co-operation of Liberal, Unionist, and Labour politicians, who had suspended ordinary party controversy in presence of a national crisis. The response was magnificent, and was a splendid tribute to the patriotism of Britain's young men; indeed, the response outran the facilities for equipment, and for a time broke down the inadequate machinery for enrolling and absorbing recruits. Lord Kitchener bent himself to the task of providing for the training and equipment of these immense numbers of new recruits, and organized them into a number of "New Armies", as they were officially called. Popularly, but incorrectly, they were described as "Kitchener's Army". The Territorial regiments volunteered for foreign service almost to a man and a unit, and many of them raised second and even third-line battalions to maintain their strength and identity in case of loss at the front.

The British Dominions beyond the seas rallied splendidly to the help of the Motherland. South Africa was set the task of dealing with the colony of German South-West Africa, and had to suppress an internal revolt which only served to emphasize the loyalty of the great mass of Boers and their chief leaders. General Botha, the Boer Prime Minister, himself took the command of the force which was to operate against the German colony. The other self-governing Dominions sent contingents of trained men for service in the field, and also in most cases gifts in kind. The most striking feature in the rally

of the Empire was the splendid offer of troops, treasure, and services by the 700 Indian rulers of native states. The presence of Indian troops on European battlefields was to be a noteworthy feature of the war, and it was to have the effect of strengthening the bonds of sympathy between Britain and her great dependency.

FRENCH AND GERMAN PLANS.—In the official French survey of the first six months of war there occurs the following statement regarding General Joffre's early plans:—

“Our plan of concentration had foreseen the possibility of two principal actions, the one on the right between the Vosges and the Moselle, the other on the left to the north of the Verdun-Toul line, this double possibility involving the eventual variation of our transport. On August 2, owing to the Germans passing through Belgium, our concentration was substantially modified by General Joffre, in order that our principal effort might be directed to the north.”

General Joffre seems to have made the mistake at the outset of not providing quickly and strongly enough to meet an invasion through Belgium, perhaps owing to an excessive reliance upon the strength of Belgium's fortress defences along the Meuse, perhaps owing to faulty reconnaissance. The initial French offensive in Alsace was partly intended to divert German forces from the north, but it was probably intended even more to give a dramatic political motive to the campaign. Nothing was so likely to arouse the martial ardour of Frenchmen as the hope of recovering the lost provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. The political motive was strengthened by a rather grandiloquent manifesto published by Joffre to the people of Alsace at the time of the first French offensive there. Since then Joffre has been distinguished for silent, grim persistence rather than grandiloquence, just like Lord Kitchener.

The original German concentration against France seems to have consisted of twenty Army Corps, each with a Reserve Division, grouped in six armies of different size, each strengthened by cavalry divisions and other additional troops. Very soon after the beginning of the campaign a new army seems to have been formed between the Second and the Third of the original scheme, to operate against the Meuse about Dinant. After this change the German armies and their commanders were nearly as follows:—

First Army, under General von Kluck; Corps VII, IX, X, reinforced later by II; the army that took Liège and Brussels and swept south-west across Belgium to Mons.

Second Army, under General von Bülow; Corps III, XI, and Prussian Guards; to advance against Namur and up the Meuse and Sambre by Charleroi.

Third Army, under General von Hausen; the Saxon Corps XII and XIX and a Reserve Corps; to advance by the northern Ardennes to Dinant.

Fourth Army, under the Duke of Württemberg; Corps IV and XIII and Reserves; to advance across the southern Ardennes by Neufchâteau.

The Story of the Great War

Fifth Army, under the Imperial Crown Prince; Corps VIII, XVI, XVIII; to move across the extreme south of the Ardennes to Montmédy.

Sixth Army, under the Crown Prince of Bavaria; the three Bavarian Corps and Corp XXI; to move from Metz north of Verdun.

Seventh Army, under General von Heeringen, Inspector-General of the Second Inspection; Corps XIV and XV; based on Strassburg to hold Alsace.

In this scheme we see a very strong right wing, consisting of the First and Second Armies, a strong centre directed against the central Meuse, and a weaker left intended for defence rather than attack. The French operations against the weak left in Alsace and Lorraine were not made in sufficient force to affect the fortunes of the campaign to any serious extent. They represented a compromise between a defensive and an offensive strategy, and their only result was to weaken the French on the centre and left, where they needed a great force to hold the powerful German attack.

THE CAMPAIGN IN ALSACE AND LORRAINE.—The first French movement against Alsace was little more than a raid. On 7 August a brigade from the fortress of Belfort advanced by the Gap of Belfort against the small town of Altkirch, which was taken with ease, because it was very weakly held. At the same time another small force crossed the Vosges and occupied Thann. The two forces then advanced on 8 August to Mülhausen, an important manufacturing town of Alsace, which was occupied without serious opposition; but next day, 9 August, a considerable body of troops from the XIVth Army Corps came from Colmar and the fortress of Neu Breisach. The French were outnumbered and their communications threatened, and in consequence they retired to Belfort on the following day. The French official account indicates that this movement into Alsace was intended to flank a more serious attack in Lorraine, but it was badly carried out by a leader who was at once relieved of his command. Joffre had already begun to show that no personal considerations would be permitted to stand in the way of success.

From 14 August onwards a more serious invasion of Alsace was undertaken, this time under General Pau, a one-armed veteran of the war of 1870, who was second only to Joffre as a master of war in France. This time the movement was closely connected with a considerable offensive in Lorraine, just north of the Vosges, under the command of General de Castelnau. General Pau seized the passes across the Vosges in succession after some fighting, the greatest opposition and difficulty being experienced in obtaining possession of the Col du Bonhomme, the Col de Sainte-Marie, and the Col de Saales. The last-named is important as commanding the head-waters of the River Bruche or Breusch, that flows east to Strassburg. Mülhausen was again occupied on the 19th, by a converging advance from south and west, after a fight in which the French captured twenty-four guns. The Germans fell back after losing heavily and abandoning great stores of shells and forage, and the French were in complete command of the

approaches to Colmar. A decisive defeat of Castelnau in Lorraine, however, and an even more serious failure in southern Belgium, both of which we are about to describe, nullified Pau's success, and on 28 August the Alsace army was broken up, only a small force being left to hold the region of Thann and the Vosges.

The campaign in Lorraine against the German left proceeded brilliantly at first. By the 19th, the day of the second French occupation of Mülhausen, Castelnau's forces had occupied Delme, Dieuze, Château Salins, and especially the important town of Saarburg, on the railway between Metz and Strassburg. German attacks from the north had been easily repulsed, but on the 20th the Germans detached a large force from Metz against Castelnau's left, and on the 21st the French suffered a heavy defeat, with great losses in guns and prisoners. The cause of the failure is said in the French official account to be found "in the strong organization of the region, in the power of the enemy's artillery, operating over ground which had been minutely surveyed, and finally in the default of certain units". The French fell back on Nancy, and had to retire from Lunéville owing to a concentration of at least three German Army Corps against it. On the 25th, however, the French by a double counter-attack, from the south and from the west, under Generals Dubail and Castelnau, drove the Germans back again, and a sort of balance was established for a time between the two armies in this region.

THE BATTLE OF DINANT.—On 15 August, the day when the last of the Liège forts fell, some cavalry from Von Hausen's Saxon Army reached the town of Dinant, which is situated on the Meuse, south of Namur. The chief part of the town lies on the east or right bank, at the base of high limestone cliffs crowned by an obsolete fortress, but there is a suburb on the west bank, joined to the main portion of the town by a bridge. Early in the morning the German troops captured the citadel from a weak French defending force, but the French brought up reinforcements of infantry and artillery in the afternoon and opened an attack upon the newly-won citadel. The Germans had to fall back before the French fire, and by nightfall they were in retreat eastwards, but not in disorder. This lively little skirmish was a prelude to the great campaign which was about to begin on the Meuse and Sambre. Its result naturally elated the French, but Joffre was very soon to be called upon to face the collapse of his main strategy before the overwhelming and well-planned German advance.

THE ALLIED ARMIES ON THE MEUSE AND SAMBRE.—It was not until the concentration of Sir John French's British force was complete on the evening of 21 August that General Joffre was able to make his final dispositions for resisting the German advance through Belgium. He seems to have intended originally to stand on the defensive along the French frontier, by Montmédy, Sedan, Mézières, Maubeuge, Valenciennes, and Lille; but the call of Belgium could not be wholly resisted, although the time was past for answering it effectively by holding the line between Namur and Antwerp. Namur was still unreduced, and its

strength as a fortress was still overrated; accordingly Joffre advanced his centre and left wing into Belgium, and made Namur a *point d'appui*. His dispositions were as follows: The Third French Army (the first two were those of Alsace and Lorraine, under Castelnau and Dubail) was drawn up under General Ruffey along the central Meuse from Montmédy to Rocroi; the Fourth Army, under General Langle de Cary, extended northwards down the Meuse from Rocroi; the Fifth Army, under General Lanrezac, lay along the Sambre from Namur, crossing the river at Charleroi; to the west of this, along the line Binche-Mons-Condé, was the British army. In front of Arras there was a reserve French force under General d'Amade, and south of Maubeuge, at Avesnes, General Sordet was in command of three French Cavalry Divisions. Ruffey and Langle de Cary formed the French centre, facing the Crown Prince and the Duke of Württemberg; Lanrezac and Sir John French formed the left of the allied line, facing Von Bülow and Von Kluck respectively. Sir John French and the British Army acted throughout the whole campaign under the supreme command of General Joffre, who was responsible for the strategy in the west, but French and Joffre co-operated admirably. This co-operation doubtless followed the main lines of the scheme worked out in the secret military conversations that had been proceeding since 1906.

We have already said that the British Army consisted of two Army Corps, a Cavalry Division, and a Cavalry Brigade. The First Corps, under Sir Douglas Haig, consisted of the 1st Division, under Major-General Lomax, and the 2nd Division, under Major-General Monro. The Second Corps, under Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien, comprised the 3rd Division, under Major-General Hubert Hamilton, and the 5th Division, under Lieutenant-General Sir Charles Fergusson, Bart. The Cavalry Division of four Cavalry Brigades was under Major-General Allenby, and the independent Cavalry Brigade was commanded by Brigadier-General Sir Philip W. Chetwode, Bart. The 4th Division, which was to constitute part of the Third Army Corps, under the command of Lieutenant-General W. P. Pulteney, was employed under Major-General T. D. Snow on the lines of communication. The regiments of infantry included in the Expeditionary Force at the outset of the campaign were as follows: Coldstream Guards, Scots Guards, Black Watch, Royal Munster Fusiliers, Royal Sussex Regiment, Loyal North Lancashire Regiment, Northamptonshire Regiment, King's Royal Rifle Corps, Royal West Surrey Regiment, South Wales Borderers, Gloucestershire Regiment, Welsh Regiment, Grenadier Guards, Irish Guards, Worcestershire Regiment, Oxfordshire and Bucks Light Infantry, Highland Light Infantry, Connaught Rangers, Liverpool Regiment, South Staffordshire Regiment, Royal Berkshire Regiment, South Lancashire Regiment, Wiltshire Regiment, Royal Irish Rifles, Royal Scots, Royal Irish Regiment, Middlesex Regiment, Gordon Highlanders, Northumberland Fusiliers, Royal Fusiliers, Lincolnshire Regiment, Royal Scots Fusiliers, King's Own Scottish Borderers, West Riding Regiment, Royal West Kent Regiment,

Yorkshire Light Infantry, Suffolk Regiment, East Surrey Regiment, Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry, Manchester Regiment, Norfolk Regiment, Bedfordshire Regiment, Cheshire Regiment, Dorsetshire Regiment, Royal Warwickshire Regiment, Seaforth Highlanders, Royal Irish Fusiliers, Royal Dublin Fusiliers, Somerset Light Infantry, East Lancashire Regiment, Hampshire Regiment, Rifle Brigade, Royal Lancaster Regiment, Lancashire Fusiliers, Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, and Essex Regiment. The cavalry comprised the 2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Dragoon Guards, the 2nd Dragoons, the 3rd, 4th, 11th, 18th, and 20th Hussars, the 5th, 9th, 12th, and 16th Lancers, and a composite regiment of the Household Cavalry. There were also Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, &c.

THE FALL OF NAMUR.—The fortified city of Namur, at the confluence of the Sambre and the Meuse, formed a dangerous salient in the French line, and the rapid reduction of the forts by German heavy siege-guns was to be an important factor in placing the French and British in dire peril. Namur was a ring fortress of the same type as Liège. Of its nine forts, all of the same construction as those already described in connection with Liège, three (Maizeret, Andoy, Dave) were situated in the angle of the Meuse, to the south-east of the city; two (St. Héribert and Malonne) between the Meuse and the Sambre, to the south-west; three (Suarlée, Émines, Cognelée) between the Sambre and the railway north to Brussels; and one (Marchevelette) between the Meuse and the Brussels railway, to the north-east. (See map facing p. 238.) The Belgians made considerable preparations for holding Namur until the French and British armies could come to their support. The lines between the forts were entrenched for infantry and protected by barbed-wire entanglements, and a Division of the Belgian Army, under General Michel, was allocated for the defence. The Germans, however, succeeded, partly owing to misty weather, in bringing their 11-inch siege howitzers, and perhaps also some of the still larger 17-inch guns, into position for attacking the forts without encountering any opposition. When the howitzers came into action, the Belgian defenders had no chance, because the guns of their forts were completely outclassed and outranged, and detachments of the armies of Von Bülow and Von Hausen, which had moved up the Meuse, were able to carry everything before them.

The attack on Namur began on 20 August, the day when Brussels was occupied, and by the morning of the 21st the Belgians had been driven from the trenches between the forts Cognelée and Marchevelette by the heavy gun-fire, which wrought terrible havoc amongst them, and made it impossible for them to reply. This gave the Germans access to the interior of the fortress-ring, and when, one after another, the forts Maizeret, Marchevelette, Andoy, Dave, and St. Héribert were reduced during the 21st, further resistance became hopeless. A body of Germans from Von Hausen's victorious force advanced northwards within the fortress-ring, and co-operating with those who had entered earlier from the north-east, cut off the retreat of those Belgians who had manned the

north-western trenches. These brave defenders fought on as long as they could, but were forced to surrender on the 25th. General Michel was able to draw off many of his troops to the south-west by way of Philippeville, Laon, and Amiens to Rouen, where they took ship for Ostend to rejoin the main Belgian army under King Albert. The Germans occupied the town of Namur on 23 August, and on 26 August the last forts to hold out, Suarlée and Émines, fell before the overwhelming artillery bombardment. The fall of the place was so rapid that the retreat was almost a rout, and huge quantities of supplies were left behind in the hands of the conquerors. The Belgian losses in killed, wounded, and prisoners amounted to more than half their force.

THE FRENCH DEFEAT ON THE MEUSE.—On the very day, 21 August, when the Germans began to pierce the fortress-ring of Namur, thus depriving the French of a vital *point d'appui*, General Joffre took the offensive in the centre along the Meuse and the Semois with the French Third and Fourth Armies under Ruffey and Langle de Cary. According to the French official statement these armies comprised ten Army Corps, and they were therefore probably at least as strong as the German armies, those of Von Hausen, the Duke of Württemberg, and the Imperial Crown Prince, opposed to them. Their offensive failed disastrously on the following day, 22 August, but the causes have not yet been fully disclosed. The French official statement merely says in general terms:—

“There were in this affair individual and collective failures, imprudences committed under the fire of the enemy, divisions ill-engaged, rash deployments and precipitate retreats, a premature waste of men, and, finally, the inadequacy of certain of our troops and their leaders, both as regards the use of infantry and artillery. In consequence of these lapses the enemy, turning to account the difficult terrain, was able to secure the maximum of profit from the advantages which the superiority of his subaltern cadres gave him.”

The decisive stroke seems to have been the crossing of the Meuse between Namur and Dinant by Von Hausen's Saxon Army. Von Hausen, having thus broken the French line, turned first against the right rear of Lanrezac's Army of the Sambre, which Von Bülow was driving south, as we shall see presently, and then against the left flank of Langle de Cary's army, which was simultaneously engaged in front with the Duke of Württemberg. The French armies of the centre, taken in flank and front simultaneously, and not yet on a high level of efficiency, were compelled to retreat from the Meuse. Von Hausen's force seems to have been a surprise to Joffre, whose aerial corps could not work to much purpose in an irregular, wooded country like the Ardennes.

THE BATTLE OF CHARLEROI.—The French official survey says that Joffre's manœuvre had still a chance of success if the left, that is, Lanrezac's Army of the Sambre and the British Army, secured a decisive result; but victory on the left was clearly impossible after the

retreat from the Meuse. Lanrezac's army, reinforced to the extent of two Army Corps, a corps of cavalry, and some reserve divisions, became engaged on 22 August in a fierce fight with Von Bülow's army for the crossings of the Sambre, especially at Charleroi. The town was taken and retaken several times during the 22nd and the 23rd, and on the latter day it finally passed into the hands of the Germans. There was much hot fighting at close quarters in the streets, and the town suffered severely from bombardment by both sides. Lanrezac, driven back, and threatened on his right rear by Von Hausen's Saxons from across the Meuse, was compelled to retreat. This left Sir John French's force, on the extreme left of the Allied line, in the air and in imminent danger of annihilation by the overwhelming numbers of Von Kluck and Von Bülow. To the fortunes of this British Army we must now turn.

THE BATTLE OF MONS.—Sir John French, having completed his concentration on 21 August, put his little force in position on the 22nd so as to play the part assigned to him in the plans of General Joffre. His line was, it is true, mainly on Belgian soil, but he was just over the French frontier and was primarily engaged in the defence of France. The Belgians had doubtless expected British aid to reach them in the heart of their own country, but circumstances rendered this impossible. His First Army Corps, under Haig, was posted along the line from Mons to Binche, and his Second Corps, under Smith-Dorrien, along the canal running westwards from Mons to the French town of Condé-sur-l'Escaut, on the Scheldt. Mons, in his centre, is the chief town of the important Belgian coal-mining district known as the Borinage. Sir Philip Chetwode's Cavalry Brigade was posted at Binche, and General Allenby's Cavalry Division was situated in the rear to act as a reserve, especially on the left flank. On the 22nd and 23rd, Chetwode, reinforced by a few squadrons from the Cavalry Division, made cavalry reconnaissances as far as Soignies, during which some of the mounted men had successful brushes with the enemy. French at this time was under the impression that he was opposed to only one or two German Army Corps, with additional cavalry, and therefore awaited their attack with confidence. He was informed in this sense by French headquarters, and their information seemed to be confirmed by his own cavalry and aerial reconnaissances.


The German attack began early on Sunday afternoon (23rd), and was particularly directed against the British right. British troops then gained their first experience of warfare under modern conditions. Hundreds of well-placed field-guns sent forth their shells against the British positions, and were assisted to find their range by daring air-men. Then the enemy rushed forward in dense masses, with rifles and machine-guns, and were received with a murderous and well-directed fire from the British trenches. Driven back with heavy loss, more of them came on, reckless of life in their attempt to break the British lines. The canal bridges on the British left were special objects of attack, and heroic deeds were done in defending them and later in destroying

them when retreat was seen to be inevitable. Binche soon became untenable, and Haig had to withdraw his right flank to some high ground south of Brag, while Chetwode's cavalry moved farther south. This made a dangerous salient at the town of Mons, where General Hamilton's 3rd Division was stationed, and Smith-Dorrien received instructions to withdraw from Mons if seriously threatened. About 5 o'clock the whole plan had to be reconsidered in the light of startling information received from General Joffre by telegraph. It had been ascertained that at least three German corps were advancing against French, and that a fourth corps (the IInd) was endeavouring to turn his left flank from the direction of Tournai. At the same time the British leader was informed of the French defeat and retreat at Charleroi, information that he ought to have received earlier if the French staff had done its duty. Aeroplane reconnaissance confirmed Joffre's information regarding the German strength in front of the British, and Sir John French, realizing his almost desperate situation, resolved to effect a retirement at daybreak on the 24th to a position which he had already reconnoitred as a precautionary measure even before retreat was considered a serious possibility. This position extended from the fortress of Maubeuge on the right through Bavai, his headquarters during the Mons engagement, to Jenlain, south-east of Valenciennes, on the left. (See accompanying map.)

THE BRITISH RETREAT BEGUN.—The retirement was naturally, in the circumstances, an operation attended with very grave risk of disaster, but the skill of the leaders and the bravery and endurance of the men rose to the emergency and maintained the reputation of British arms. At daybreak on the 24th the 2nd Division of the First Corps, under General Monro, occupying the inside right position, made a demonstration from Harmignies as though to retake Binche, while the 1st Division on its right, under General Lomax, took up a supporting position near Peissant. Under cover of this demonstration Smith-Dorrien's corps was able to retire to the line Quarouble-Dour-Frameries, but its 3rd Division suffered severely from the enemy, who were by this time in possession of the town of Mons. The 19th Infantry Brigade, which had been brought up from the line of communications to Valenciennes on the 22nd and 23rd, was stationed south of Quarouble on the morning of the 24th to reinforce the left flank of Smith-Dorrien's corps. When the Second Corps had effected its retreat to the position indicated, it partially entrenched itself and held its ground while Haig withdrew his men to the Bavai-Maubeuge line, which was reached about 7 p.m. The German pressure was now being felt severely on the British left, and about 7.30 a.m. Sir Charles Fergusson, in command of the 5th Division, called General Allenby's cavalry to his assistance. During Allenby's operations one of his brigade commanders, General De Lisle, attempted to check the German infantry advance by a mounted attack on its flank, but he was held up by lines of wire, and two of his regiments, the 9th Lancers and the 18th Hussars, suffered heavily. Captain Grenfell


KEY TO LETTERING, ETC.

- † Chief engagements during the Retreat.
- A. British Positions at Mons, August 23.
- B. Retiring Line of 2nd Army Corps, August 24.
- C. British Lines, evening, August 24.
- D. British Lines, August 25-26.
- E. Position of General Sordet's Cavalry, August 23-26.
- F. General direction of French Retreat.
- G. General d'Amade's movement from Arras to assist the British.
- H. British Lines, August 26-27.
- J. British Lines, August 28.



- K. British Lines, August 29.
- L. British Lines, September 3.
- M. British Lines, September 6.
- N. Sixth French Army, September 6.
- O. Von Kluck's Army, September 6.
- P. Fifth French Army.

Approximate British Lines of Retreat, August 28 to September 3.



MAP SHOWING LINE OF BRITISH RETREAT FROM MONS TO THE MARNE

of the former regiment gained the Victoria Cross for leading his squadron to save a derelict field-battery under heavy fire. Aided by Allenby's cavalry, Smith-Dorrien succeeded in effecting the retirement of his corps to the line Bavai-Bry by nightfall, with the 19th Infantry Brigade on the left from Bry to Jenlain, but faced by two corps on his front and one on his flank, he suffered heavy loss in doing so. On the same day as French began his retreat the IInd German Corps occupied Tournai on his left flank, after capturing its French Territorial defenders under the Marquis de Villaret and also a British field-battery. The Germans evidently intended to turn the British left flank and drive the British force into the fortress of Maubeuge, where it would soon be taken prisoner, but Sir John French was fully alive to this danger.

THE RETREAT TO THE OISE.—Faced by the failure of his offensive against the German centre and by the collapse of his initial strategy, General Joffre quickly decided upon a fighting strategic retreat as the best course open to him. This involved the abandonment of much of north-eastern France as well as most of Belgium to the German invaders, but the time for resuming the offensive under more favourable conditions would come in due course. Counter-attacks were to be made as often as possible during the retreat in order to keep the enemy busy, and the retreating armies were to keep in touch throughout so as to be ready, when the time came, to resume the offensive together. On 26 August a new Sixth Army was constituted under General Maunoury, composed of two Army Corps, five reserve divisions, and a Moorish brigade, about 200,000 in all. This army was to assemble about Amiens between 27 August and 1 September, and to co-operate with the British against the German right. It played an important part in forcing Von Kluck's retreat at the battle of the Marne, but the German advance was so rapid that it could not be brought into effective operation sooner.

Early on the morning of 25 August, in spite of the exhausted state of his troops, Sir John French began the second stage of his retreat. The movement of the Second Corps was covered by two Cavalry Brigades and the Divisional Cavalry of the Corps, while the remainder of the Cavalry Division along with the 19th Infantry Brigade, all under General Allenby, protected the west flank. The 4th Division, under General Snow, had been ordered up from the lines of communication, and had detrained at Le Cateau on the 23rd. It was ordered by French to take up a position from Solesmes to the Cambrai-Le Cateau road, in order to protect the First and Second Corps in their retirement to the line Cambrai-Le Cateau-Landrecies, which was the objective for the night of the 25th. The First Corps marched to the east of the Mormal Forest and reached Landrecies about 10 o'clock in the evening. The Second Corps, marching west of the forest, had reached Le Cateau a few hours earlier, and held the line from that town west to Caudry, with General Snow's 4th Division extending farther west to Seranvillers. General Snow's Division was now placed under the orders of

The Story of the Great War

General Smith-Dorrien, the commander of the Second Corps. While the First Corps was taking up its position at Landrecies, the 4th or Guards Brigade was heavily attacked by a part of the IXth German Army Corps which had come through the Mormal Forest, and there were heavy losses on both sides, but especially among the Germans, during the violent fighting at close quarters in the streets of the little town. Haig's 1st Division also became heavily engaged at the same time south and east of Maroilles, and Sir John French had to call to its assistance two French reserve divisions from the Fifth Army on his right.

The 26 August was the most critical day of this arduous and dangerous retreat before overwhelming forces. The retreat never became a rout, but it is evident that there was often a considerable amount of confusion, owing to the relentless pressure of the enemy. At times companies were formed from men of many different regiments who had been separated from their units, but in spite of some chaos of this sort the retreat was orderly, and from a military standpoint it was a masterly achievement. Early on the 26th Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien found himself opposed to the guns of four German Army Corps, and considered it impossible to continue his retirement in face of such an attack. Sir John French thereupon urged him to do his utmost to break off action and retire at the earliest possible moment, because no support could be given him, owing to the exhausted state of the First Corps. General Sordet, with the French Cavalry Corps, was advancing towards Smith-Dorrien's rear, but owing to the fatigue of his horses found it impossible to render any assistance. Sordet had been appealed to for help by French two days before, but he could not act without the consent of his chief, and in any case his horses were too tired to move far at the time. For eight hours the Second Corps had to face a furious German attack by overwhelmingly superior numbers. The British artillery was exceptionally brilliant in its counter-attack, but all arms covered themselves with glory, although at heavy cost.

About half-past three in the afternoon, owing to a dangerous threatening movement on both flanks, further retirement of this hard-pressed corps was begun under the protection of the artillery and cavalry, and during the withdrawal several daring deeds won the Victoria Cross. Sir John French was very warm in his praise of Smith-Dorrien's coolness, intrepidity, and determination during this most difficult and dangerous operation. The retreat of the British army continued right through the 26th and the two following days, and by the evening of the 28th it occupied the line Noyon-Chauny-La Fère, along the line of the River Oise. The First Corps had passed from the Sambre to the Oise by way of Wassigny and Ribemont, the Second Corps from the Scheldt to the Somme at St. Quentin and Ham, and thence to the Oise at Noyon and Chauny. On the 28th the retreat was harassed by two of the enemy's cavalry columns moving south-east from St. Quentin. One of these, consisting of Uhlans and part of the Prussian Guard, was driven back with heavy loss by the 3rd Cavalry

Brigade under Brigadier-General Gough, and the other was routed by Chetwode's 5th Cavalry Brigade. On the 27th and 28th the French cavalry under Sordet rendered valuable assistance, as also General d'Amade's reserve divisions from Arras.

The terrible pressure of the five days of retreating and fighting, 23-28 August, was now ended, and the exhausted troops were able to get a real rest at last. General Joffre appears to have contemplated taking the offensive at this point with the aid of Maunoury's new Sixth Army, but he judged it better to continue the strategic retreat, if need be as far as the line of the Seine and Aube. Events were to give him his chance before he had gone so far, only however to establish a prolonged equilibrium along lines so strongly entrenched and defended as to be almost better described as fortified. Nevertheless, Paris was to be saved, and that was a matter of vital importance to the national *moral* of France.

THE FRENCH RETREAT TO THE MARNE.—The French armies of the centre and left had been thoroughly defeated, not merely outnumbered like the British, and they were already in retreat before Sir John French felt it necessary to fall back from the line of his original concentration. This retreat was continued parallel to the British retreat, but apparently under less severe pressure, across the Meuse and the Aisne right to the Marne, where at length, reinforced by new armies, they were able, in co-operation with the British, to make a stand, and recover some of the ground yielded. While Von Kluck was driving the British up the valley of the Sambre, and then down the valley of the Oise towards Paris, Von Bülow, forcing back Lanrezac's army, advanced by the Chimay gap and took Hirson, a small fortress at a railway crossing of some importance. From there his way led on to Laon and the Aisne valley. Langle de Cary's defeated Fourth Army contested the Meuse crossing at Donchery, between Sedan and Mézières, with the Duke of Württemberg's army, but, threatened on its left flank by Von Hausen, had to give way on 27 August, and retreat to the Aisne. There was fierce fighting at Reims on the 28th and 29th, during which the town was largely burned down, and Langle de Cary had to fall back across the Aisne. The Crown Prince drove Ruffey's Third Army before him by Montmédy and Longuyon towards the Argonne, an upland, wooded district between the upper Aisne and the upper Meuse. In the course of this advance the small fort of Longwy fell on 28 August, after an unexpectedly prolonged resistance under Lieutenant-Colonel Darche. Montmédy and Mézières were surrendered without any attempt to hold their forts, but farther north Maubeuge, which had been invested after French's retreat from it, held out until 7 September, thereby impeding seriously the German lines of supply by rail. The Germans were apparently trying to pierce the French centre as well as outflank their left, in the hope of compelling a surrender of the whole left wing, consisting of Lanrezac's Fifth Army and Sir John French's force.

THE END OF THE RETREAT.—The British force hoped when it

reached the line Noyon-Chauny-La Fère, along the River Oise, that the time had come for the offensive, but the strong advance of the German armies of the centre had met with so much success that the line of fortified places—Reims, Laon, La Fère—along which a stand was expected to be made had been practically turned on its right. Further retreat was necessary, at least to the Marne, and possibly as far as the Seine. The turning movement of Von Kluck's extreme right, consisting of the IInd Corps, with four Cavalry Divisions, had swept almost unimpeded over the country north-west of the British army. Tournai was taken on the 24th after some fighting, as we have already noted. Lille, although it had fort defences, was not seriously held, and soon Arras, and then Amiens, fell into German hands. The loss of these places cut Sir John French's railway communications with his bases at Boulogne and Havre, and his base was then moved to St. Nazaire, at the mouth of the Loire, with an advance base at Le Mans. The command of the sea made it possible to change his base with ease in this way, so long as the main forces were intact even if retreating. Among the skirmishes that took place in this north-western district that at Bapaume, to the south of Arras, stands out conspicuously. Here a body of French Territorials, in serious danger of being completely cut off by a superior German force, was saved by a detachment of British troops.

At one o'clock on the 29th General Joffre visited Sir John French at his headquarters, and the two commanders consulted on the position. Joffre said that he had directed the Fifth French Army, then along the Oise from La Fère to Guise, to move forward and attack the Germans, who were facing it along the Somme five or six corps strong. This army ably carried out his orders on the same day, and substantially relieved the pressure on the British by a victorious action at Guise against two German corps. He also told French of the formation of the Sixth French Army on his left flank, where it was facing three or four German corps, and of a new Ninth Army under General Foch, which was being placed between the Fourth and Fifth French armies. It was arranged that French should retire to the line Compiègne-Soissons, extending from the Oise to the Aisne, keeping in touch with the French on his right throughout. This retirement to Compiègne-Soissons was effected during the 29th, and it was on this day also that French changed his sea base. The retirement of the British forces continued practically from day to day, in harmony with the movement of the French armies. Rear-guard actions were fought constantly, but the pursuit was not so severe an ordeal as during the early days, especially at Le Cateau.

Two smart little engagements fall to be recorded on 1 September. South of Compiègne, in a wooded country, the 1st Cavalry Brigade, under Brigadier-General Briggs, had a brush with Germany cavalry and lost a battery of Horse Artillery for a time. Some infantry of the Third Corps, however, came to the rescue, and enabled them not only to recover the lost guns but to capture twelve of the enemy's.

More to the east, at Villers-Cotterets, the 4th Brigade, consisting of Grenadier, Coldstream, and Irish Guards, on the same day fought a stubborn rear-guard action, in which they drove off the enemy, but only after suffering heavy losses. Lieutenant-Colonel Morris of the Irish Guards was killed, and Brigadier-General Scott-Kerr, the Brigade commander, was wounded. On 3 September the British forces were south of the Marne, extending from Lagny to Signy-Signets, across the lower course of its tributary, the Grand Morin. The British had destroyed the Marne bridges behind them, but the Germans rebridged the river and followed in considerable force, and French accordingly retreated farther. By 5 September he had reached a position farther up the Grand Morin River, about Coulommiers, and on that day Joffre informed him that the time for the offensive had come. The circumstances that made the offensive possible will be explained in a later chapter, treating of the campaign of the Marne. On 4 September the French Government had removed to Bordeaux as a precautionary measure, and it did not return until the danger to Paris had been finally removed by the Franco-British advance.

